

**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. S. Alward  
Prof. B. Amiro  
Prof. J. Anderson  
Prof. M. Araji  
Prof. M. Atleo  
Dean J. Beddoes  
Prof. P. Blunden  
Prof. T. Booth  
Mr. J. Botha  
Very Rev. R. Bozyk  
Prof. M. Brabston  
Ms. M. Brolley  
Ms. S.-M. Chaillot  
Prof. N. Chow  
Prof. D. Churchill  
Dr. D. Collins  
Mr. G. Csepregi  
Prof. R. Desai  
Dean J. Doering  
Prof. M. Edwards  
Prof. B. Elias  
Prof. J. Embree  
Prof. M. Eskin  
Prof. E. Etcheverry  
Prof. A. Farenhorst  
Prof. M. Gabbert  
Ms. M. Gabbs  
Rectrice R. Gagné  
Prof. J. Guard  
Mr. R. Hagemeister  
Dean N. Halden  
Prof. J. Hughes  
Prof. J. Irvine  
Prof. J. Johnson  
Prof. A. Katz  
Prof. V. Keown  
Dr. J. Keselman  
Prof. W. Kinsner  
Mr. B. Kleinsasser  
Prof. A. McIntosh  
Prof. D. McMillan

Dean D. Mandzuk  
Prof. D. Mann  
Mr. S. Moreno  
Prof. J. Morrill  
Dean B. O'Connell  
Ms. A. Owuapu  
Prof. F. Parkinson  
Prof. T. Podolsky  
Prof. D. Polyzois  
Ms. J. Rebizant  
Acting Dean R.  
Roshko  
Mr. C. Smith  
Prof. K. Smith  
Prof. D. Smyth  
Prof. H. Soliman  
Mr. L. Solomon  
Prof. B. Southern  
Mr. D. Sushko  
Prof. K. Smith  
Prof. R. Tate  
Dean J. Taylor  
Dr. M. Torchia  
Dean M. Trevan  
Prof. C. Trott  
Dean L. Turnbull  
Prof. C. Van Winkle  
Prof. P. Venkatesh  
Dean J. Watkinson  
Prof. K. Wrogemann  
Prof. A. Young  
Mr. J. Leclerc,  
University  
Secretary  
Dr. S. Coyston,  
Recording  
Secretary

**Assessors Present**

Mr. J. Adams  
Dr. J. Blatz  
Ms. J. Chen  
Ms. A. Ducas  
Dean H. Frankel

Prof. B. Hallman  
Prof. T. Kucera  
Mr. N. Marnoch  
Prof. K. Matheos  
Dr. J. Ristock  
Ms. D. Young

**Regrets**

Dr. C. Adams  
Ms. B. Arte  
Prof. J. Asadoorian  
Dean M. Benarroch  
Mr. S. Bounket  
Prof. A. Chiu  
Dean E. Dawe  
Prof. J. Gilchrist  
Ms. S. Gottheil  
Prof. J. Hanesiak  
Prof. P. Hess  
Prof. P. Hultin  
Prof. T. Ivanco  
Ms. S. Jasper  
Dr. D. Jayas  
Prof. E. Judd  
Mr. J. Kearsey  
Prof. J. Kettner  
Mr. P. Kochan  
Mr. E. Kraut  
Prof. L. Landrum  
Prof. A. MacDonell  
Mr. C. Martin  
Dean B. Postl  
Prof. S. Prentice  
Dr. H. Secter  
Dean G.  
Sevenhuysen  
Dr. L. Smith  
Mr. D. Sytnik  
Prof. L. Wang  
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld

**Absent**

Prof. G. Anderson  
Ms. J. Black  
Mr. R. Buchanan  
Mr. I. Cook  
Dean N. Davies  
Mr. S. Fazaluddin  
Dr. G. Glavin  
Prof. B. Hann  
Dean A. Iacopino  
Mr. C. James  
Mr. R. Jung  
Prof. J. Linklater  
Prof. R. McIlwraith  
Ms. A. Maqsood  
Ms. V. Marriott  
Mr. J. Ngo  
Mr. J. Ossachuk  
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette  
Prof. J. Owens  
Mr. Z. Pan  
Prof. K. Plaizier  
Ms. J. Sealey  
Dean R. Stern  
Prof. L. Strachan  
Prof. H. Unruh  
Dean L. Wallace  
Mr. C. Yap

**Also Present**

Dr. A. McNicol  
Ms. S. Gagnon  
Ms. H. Long  
Ms. H. Morris  
Ms. S. Munroe  
Ms. E. Popowich  
Ms. C. Préjet  
Mr. R. Ojo  
Ms. B. Usick  
Ms. S. Utsunomiya  
Ms. M. Watson

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Diana McMillan, Faculty of Nursing.

## **AGENDA**

### **I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none**

### **II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE**

1. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes** Page 3  
**RE: Department of Community Health Sciences**  
**[January 28, 2013]**

**Professor McMillan MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes concerning the Department of Community Health Sciences [dated January 28, 2013].**

**CARRIED**

### **III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards** Page 5  
**[January 17, 2013]**
2. **Correspondence from Vice-President (Research)** Page 16  
**RE: Report on Research Contract Funds Received**

In response to a question from Professor Morrill, Dr. Blatz confirmed that all contracts and research grant agreements with companies and granting organizations, other than the Tri-Council, are vetted through the Office of Research Services and the Office of Fair Practices and Legal Affairs.

3. **Student Advocacy Annual Report (2011 – 2012)** Page 20

Ms. Usick acknowledged Ms. Morris (Student Advocate), co-author of the Student Advocacy Annual Report (2011-2012). She said the Report is similar to previous years but expands on some areas where UMSU had requested that additional information be provided. Ms. Usick said the number of cases related to academic integrity, and specifically plagiarism and inappropriate collaboration, had increased over the previous year. She indicated that Student Advocacy does provide education to the University community in these two areas. A suite of tutorials created last year is being used for both education and remediation where students have been charged with academic dishonesty.

Ms. Usick informed Senate that she and Professor Wilkinson (Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs, Faculty of Arts) co-chair a working group, Orienting Toward Integrity, which will consider ways to support faculty members to promote academic integrity within the classroom. She indicated that they would be

making a presentation to the Associate Deans Undergraduate / University Liaison Officers in April.

4. **Items Approved by the Board of Governors,  
on January 29, 2013**

Page 25

IV **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

V **QUESTION PERIOD**

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

The following question was received from Professor Young, Faculty of Arts:

**For the meeting of Senate on 9 January 2013, Professor Klaus Wrogemann submitted a question about the implementation of ROSE, asking about the efficiencies of systems that off-load significant amounts of work onto students and faculty. In response, President Barnard outlined some of the successes ROSE and, in response to Professor Wrogemann's follow-up comment about considering whether a new program would save time for the end-users, President Barnard said that time must be allowed for people to become familiar with the new systems before a point of stability is reached and efficiencies are realized. Professor Wrogemann seemed to be satisfied with this response, but I was not, and so I wish to raise the issue again.**

**I am concerned about the off-loading of work onto students, faculty, and support staff that have resulted from the ROSE initiatives. The situation is really desperate in many units, including my own. The human costs have to be factored in when considering the monetary savings. People are frustrated and exhausted. Some are really angry. I know we're all struggling with the learning curve, but with some systems, that curve is not levelling out – Concur is the most extreme example of this. If the University is to continue to be an outstanding workplace, we have to pay more attention to the effects of implementing so many new systems in a relatively short timeframe. Some of the savings are not savings at all, as more and more faculty and support staff time is directed to working with systems that are not time-saving for them. Too much time is being diverted from the teaching and research functions of the University into the service of systems. Support staff are working overtime. They are getting behind in their other duties, through no fault of their own, and certainly not because they aren't working hard. I have some of the most experienced and efficient staff in the University working with me, and they are struggling.**

**I realize that members of the Administration may not be aware of all the repercussions of the implementation of ROSE, but I urge them to become aware and to be sensitive to the costs to the morale and even to the health of University employees. The point of stability at which efficiencies may be realized is not now and as more systems are introduced, that point keeps**

receding. If there are going to be monetary savings, some of those should be reinvested in hiring enough staff to run both the systems and their units efficiently. If there are monetary costs to doing this, that should be recognized as part of the price of setting up the systems that will putatively lead to greater efficiencies down the road. If the costs of hiring enough staff to run the systems and the units they are supposed to serve negates the monetary savings in the end, then the systems are not doing their job.

**My question then is: will the Administration commit to expending some of the perhaps as yet only projected monetary savings from ROSE to hire more support staff for departments and other units where the efficiency of the units and of their members—including faculty and support staff—is being undermined?**

Dr. Barnard said a request for funds to hire additional support staff, to address cumulative changes in departments, would be a legitimate claim that deans and directors might make during the annual budget process along with other claims that could be made. He reminded Senate that, relative to other similar universities, the University is underfunded by a substantial amount and operating revenues must be allocated to a variety of functions.

Professor Young proposed that, rather than addressing the situation through the budget process, a pool of funds might be created, with savings realized through ROSE initiatives, that faculties could make a claim to in order to address increased workloads in departments resulting from the implementation of ROSE initiatives. Dr. Barnard indicated that consideration would be given to the suggestion. He remarked that one challenge would be to determine in advance the size of such a fund and without weighing requests for resources from that fund against requests for other priorities.

The following question was received from the UMFA Assessor:

**A human rights complaint has been filed with the Ontario Human Rights Commission regarding hiring practices at the Confucius Institute at McMaster University. McMaster University has now announced that it will be severing its ties with the CI in July. Is the University of Manitoba still in discussions with the CIs? Is there still a possibility that a CI will be coming to the University of Manitoba?**

Dr. Collins said that the University is not in discussion with the Confucius Institute. He said that he cannot say that there is no possibility that a Confucius Institute would not be established at the University. He noted that, if a such a proposal were made, it would be considered through the established process, which includes consideration by Senate.

**VI      CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 6, 2013**

**Professor Wrogeman MOVED, seconded by Dean Taylor, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on February 6, 2013 be approved as circulated.**

**CARRIED**

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

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

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 26

Professor McMillan reported that Senate Executive had met on February 13, 2013. The comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they were made.

2. **Report of the Senate  
Planning and Priorities Committee** Page 27  
**RE: Undergraduate Enrolment Targets** (*for discussion*)

Ms. Ducas reported that, at its meeting on March 25, 2013, the Senate Planning and Priorities considered a proposal for course and curriculum changes from the Faculty of Social Work that involves the introduction of more than nine credit hours. The Committee had also received a presentation on the Bannatyne Campus Master Plan.

Ms. Ducas referred members to the Committee's report on Undergraduate Enrolment Targets and called attention to several of the observations. In particular, she noted that the proposed enrolment targets would replace existing quotas that may have been established in the early 1970s, are outdated, and are sometimes unclear. The proposed targets, which are currently being used by Deans and Directors in planning, anticipate the development and approval of a Strategic Enrolment Management (SEM) framework for the University. Ms. Ducas observed that some of the largest programs at the University, including University 1, do not have enrolment targets. Establishing targets for these programs would require discussion.

Ms. Ducas noted that enrolment targets are approved by the President. The SEM planning currently underway might result in changes to undergraduate enrolment targets. In light of SEM planning, the Vice-Provost (Academic Planning and Programs) will revisit the process for establishing enrolment targets. Ms. Ducas said the SPPC had observed that proposals to change enrolment targets should be presented to the Committee with information on the resource implications.

Professor Blunden asked if Ms. Ducas might provide more information about the Committee's discussion of the Bannatyne Campus Master Plan. Ms. Ducas said the proposal to create a Bannatyne Campus Master Plan is an exciting opportunity, as Bannatyne has not had a campus plan previously. She said the Committee had received a presentation from the architect developing the plan, Mr. Cibinel (Cibinel Architects, Ltd.), and had received a copy of the current draft of the plan. She said members had been very interested in the plan and would discuss it further at future meetings.

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

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

Professor McNicol reported that the Committee has dealt with fourteen appeals since the last report to Senate in June 2012. He provided a summary of the Hearings, as set out below. Professor McNicol recalled that Senate had approved changes to the policy and procedures for the Senate Appeals Committee in March 2012. He noted that the revisions, which included changes to the grounds for appeal, had taken effect in July 2012.

1. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Graduate Studies to require withdrawal from the program. The grounds were medical, procedural and undue hardship. The appeal was granted.
2. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Graduate Studies deny a time program extension. The grounds were medical and procedural. The appeal was returned to the Faculty of Graduate Studies as all lower body levels had not been exhausted.
3. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Nursing to deny a retroactive voluntary withdrawal. The grounds were the failure of the Faculty to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The Committee found insufficient grounds to proceed to hearing.
4. An appeal was received against a decision by the School of Art to deny a request for re-evaluation of work. The grounds were was the failure of the School to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The appeal was granted.
5. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Social Work to deny a grade change. The grounds were the failure of the Faculty to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The Committee found insufficient grounds to proceed to hearing.
6. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Education to deny a grade change. The grounds of the appeal were the failure of the faculty to follow the rules of natural justice. The appeal was returned to the Faculty of Education as new information was presented which was not available to the lower body.
7. An appeal was received against a decision by University 1 to deny a request for retroactive authorised withdrawals in three terms. The grounds were the failure of University 1 to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The appeal was denied.
8. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Medicine to deny a request to be reinstated into the program. The grounds were the failure of the Faculty of Medicine to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The appeal was denied.
9. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering to deny authorised withdrawals from three courses over the span of two terms. The grounds were the failure of Faculty of Engineering to reasonably

consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The Committee found insufficient grounds to proceed to hearing.

10. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Science to deny authorised withdrawals from all courses over the span of three terms. The grounds were the failure of Faculty of Science to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The Committee found insufficient grounds to proceed to hearing.
11. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering to deny authorised withdrawals from three courses over the span of two terms. The grounds were the failure of Faculty of Engineering to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The Committee found insufficient grounds to proceed to hearing.
12. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Social Work to deny authorised withdrawals from three courses over the span of two terms. The grounds were the failure of Faculty of Social Work to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The Committee found insufficient grounds to proceed to hearing.
13. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Social Work to deny reinstatement of grades in two courses and supplemental privileges in two courses. The grounds were the failure of Faculty of Social Work to reasonably consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed. The Committee determined that the grades in the two courses be reinstated but that the student be required to repeat the other two courses.
14. An appeal was received against a decision by the Faculty of Nursing to deny an independent review of an exam. The grounds were the failure of the Faculty or Dean to follow procedures. The Committee found insufficient grounds to proceed to hearing.

Professor McNicol noted that one appeal against a decision by the Faculty of Architecture was withdrawn by the student and that one appeal is pending.

**2. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards  
[January 29, 2013]**

Page 33

Mr. Adams called attention to one new offer, the James C.H. Anderson Memorial Actuarial Aboriginal Scholarship, noting it is accompanied by three letters of support.

**Professor Brabston MOVED, seconded by Professor Morrill, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated January 29, 2013].**

**CARRIED**

3. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Revised Policy on Examination Regulations [January 17, 2013]**

Page 39

Dr. Ristock recalled that a revised policy on Examination Regulations had been presented to Senate in June 2012. A number of issues and questions had been raised at that meeting and the policy and procedures had been referred back to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation. In the interim, broad consultations had occurred including meetings with representatives of the Faculties of Arts and Science, to address specific concerns raised by those units, and a presentation had been made to the Associate Deans Undergraduate / University Liaison Officers, with an invitation to provide feedback. Dr. Ristock said the revised policy and procedures provided with the agenda are based on the broader consultation that had occurred.

Dr. Ristock called attention to two changes that follow from particular concerns raised at the June 20, 2012 Senate meeting. First, referring to the procedures on Final Examinations, she said that broad wording had been developed to clarify who can invigilate final examinations including graduate students and support staff who are often part of the invigilation process. Second, she noted that the definition for 'special examinations' had been removed from the policy. Circumstances in which a student might have been granted a special examination now fall under deferred examinations in both the policy and the procedures on Deferred and Supplemental Examinations.

Professor Guard asked if the term "academic unit," as it is used in the documents, refers to programs or departments. Dr. Ristock said the term refers to academic units like University 1, for example. She noted that the policy and procedures had previously referred to departments but had resulted in confusion.

Referring to section 2.3.1 of the procedures on Final Examinations, on page 49 of the agenda, Professor Guard asked if it applied to take home examinations with a value of 20 percent or less assigned in the two weeks prior to the examination period. Dr. Ristock and Mr. Marnoch indicated that it did not and that it would be acceptable to assign a take home examination, as described by Professor Guard, within the two weeks prior to the examination period.

**Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation [dated January 17, 2013] regarding a revised policy on Final Examinations and Final Grades and the related Procedures on Final Examinations, Procedures on Deferred and Supplemental Examinations, and Procedures on Final Grades, effective September 1, 2013.**

**CARRIED**



X **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

1. **Election of the Chancellor**

Page 80

The Chair indicated that an election was required to elect three Senate members who are not students and two student Senators (one undergraduate and one graduate) to serve on the Chancellor Search Committee.

The University Secretary opened nominations for three Senate members who are not students to serve on the Selection Committee. On motions duly moved and seconded, Professor Brabston, Dean Turnbull, Dean Doering, and Professor Blunden were nominated. On a motion duly moved and seconded, nominations were closed.

Following a secret ballot vote, Professor Blunden, Professor Brabston, and Dean Turnbull were declared **ELECTED** to the Chancellor Search Committee.

The University Secretary opened nominations for an undergraduate student Senator to serve on the Selection Committee. On a motion duly moved and seconded, Ms. Gabbs was nominated. There were no additional nominations.

Ms. Gabbs was declared **ELECTED** to the Chancellor Search Committee.

The University Secretary opened nominations for a graduate student Senator to serve on the Selection Committee. On a motion duly moved and seconded, Mr. Moreno was nominated. There were no additional nominations.

Mr. Moreno was declared **ELECTED** to the Chancellor Search Committee.

XI **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 9, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 80, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on March 6, 2013.