

September 4, 2013

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
Dr. C. Adams
Ms. K. Adams
Prof. S. Alward
Prof. G. Anderson
Prof. J. Anderson
Prof. J. Asadoorian
Prof. H. Aukema
Ms. F. Bakhtiari
Dean J. Beddoes
Dean M. Benarroch
Acting Dean M.
Benbow
Prof. P. Blunden
Prof. M. Brabston
Prof. D. Brewin
Ms. M. Brolley
Prof. D. Brown
Prof. F. Burczynski
Prof. A. Calder
Prof. M. Campbell
Prof. T. Chen
Prof. A. Chiu
Mr. Z. Courtemanche
Ms. K. Daaca
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. R. Desai
Dean J. Doering
Prof. M. Edwards
Mr. C. Ekenna
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Prof. A. Farenhorst
Mr. L. Ford
Prof. M. Gabbert
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Ms. S. Gottheil
Mr. J. Hart
Prof. R. Hechter
Prof. P. Hultin
Prof. T. Ivanco
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. V. Keown

Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. P. Kochan
Prof. L. Landrum
Ms. M. Leaf
Prof. R. Lobdell
Prof. D. Lussier
Prof. D.
MacPherson
Dean D. Mandzuk
Mr. G. Mejicanos
Prof. T. Mondor
Prof. J. Morrill
Dean J. Mulvale
Dean B. O'Connell
Mr. E. Okeke
Prof. F. Parkinson
Mr. A. Pawlak
Prof. T. Podolsky
Prof. D. Polyzois
Prof. S. Prentice
Prof. C. Roche
Mr. J. Silverstein
Prof. B. Southern
Prof. L. Strachan
Prof. R. Tate
Dean J. Taylor
Mr. A. Thapa
Prof. C. Trott
Mr. A. Turnbull
Dean L. Turnbull
Prof. H. Unruh
Mr. M. Vasconcelos
Prof. P. Venkatesh
Dean L. Wallace
Prof. L. Wang
Mr. B.
Warnakulasooriya
Dean M. Whitmore
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld
Mr. K. Zeid
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University
Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,

Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. J. Adams
Dr. D. Collins
Prof. B. Hann
Prof. T. Kucera
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. K. Matheos
Mr. M. Rahimian
Dr. L. Smith
Dr. M. Torchia
Ms. D. Young

Regrets

Ms. S. Ally
Prof. B. Amiro
Dr. J. Blatz
Prof. T. Booth
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. P. Cattini
Mr. G. Chappellaz
Prof. N. Chow
Mr. G. Csepregi
Dean N. Davies
Ms. A. Ducas
Prof. D. Funk
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. J. Guard
Prof. B. Hallman
Prof. P. Hess
Prof. J. Hughes
Ms. E. Hunzinger
Mr. J. Kearsey
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette
Dean B. Postl
Dr. H. Secter
Dean G.
Sevenhuysen

Prof. D. Smyth
Ms. E. Stone
Ms. J. Tan
Prof. A. Young

Absent

Prof. M. Araji
Mr. R. Buchanan
Prof. B. Elias
Dr. G. Glavin
Dean A. Iacopino
Ms. M. Igweagu
Ms. I. Kaur
Prof. J. Kettner
Ms. B. Lewicki
Prof. J. Linklater
Mr. S. Mack
Prof. D. Mann
Ms. V. Marriott
Prof. A. Menkis
Mr. J. Patterson
Ms. E. Popowich
Dr. J. Ristock
Dean R. Stern
Dean M. Trevan

Also Present

Ms. M. Amyot
Ms. S. Gagnon
Mr. B. Hughes
Mr. S. James
Ms. H. Long
Ms. C. Préjet
Ms. B. Usick
Ms. S. Utsunomiya

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

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees [August 28, 2013]

In keeping with past practice, the minutes of this agenda item are not included in the circulated minutes but appear in the original minutes, which are available for inspection by members of Senate.

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

1. Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes RE: Department of Civil Engineering [May 29, 2013] Page 3

2. Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes RE: Departments of Accounting and Finance, Physiology, and Microbiology [June 28, 2013] Page 5

3. Proposal from Extended Education Division for a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Aerospace Program Management Page 9

Professor Anderson MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes RE: Department of Civil Engineering [dated May 29, 2013], the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes RE: Departments of Accounting and Finance, Physiology, and Microbiology [dated June 28, 2013], and a proposal from the Division of Extended Education for a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Aerospace Program Management.

CARRIED

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards Part A - June 20, 2013 Page 79

2. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards Part A -August 7, 2013 Page 91

3. Report of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission Report [August 1, 2013] Page 95

(a) Developing Essential Skills and Abilities Requirements for Programs Subject to External Accreditation Page 97

(b) **Developing *Bona Fide* Academic Requirements for Programs not Subject to External Accreditation**

Page 104

Dr. Smith, Co-Chair, Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission Report, said the Working Group's Report had been provided for information, for the purpose of receiving Senate's feedback. The Report concerns progress made toward implementing two recommendations in the Cooper Commission Report¹ concerning "Standards Identification," namely developing essential skills and abilities documents for programs subject to external accreditation and identifying bona fide academic requirements for programs not subject to external accreditation. Dr. Smith invited Dean Taylor, Chair of a sub-committee of the Working Group to comment on the proposed plan.

Dean Taylor reiterated that the documents attached to the report had been provided for information and comment. The document "Developing Essential Skills and Abilities Requirements for Programs Subject to External Accreditation" would be brought to Senate for approval in October. Referring to the second document, "Developing *Bona Fide* Academic Requirements for Programs not Subject to External Accreditation," Dean Taylor explained that several programs had volunteered to participate in a pilot project to test the two paths to *bona fide* academic requirements (BFARs) described on page 108 of the agenda. The pilot will be completed in the Fall term. It is anticipated that it will result in changes to the second document before it is brought to Senate for approval in the first half of 2014.

Dean Taylor said the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning would assist academic units with the development of essential skills and BFAR requirements and had been provided with additional resources for this purpose.

Dean Taylor called attention to the definition of programs "subject to external accreditation," on page 99 of the agenda. He explained that, where an external regulatory body requires a program to have an essential skills document, the program would have to develop such a document for Senate approval, if it has not already done so. Where a program is accredited but the external regulatory body does not require an essential skills document, the program could choose to develop either essential skills and abilities documents or BFARs.

Dean Taylor called attention to two proposed paths to developing BFARs, as delineated in the document "Developing *Bona Fide* Academic Requirements for Programs not Subject to External Accreditation" (page 108). The paths would give guidance on how to identify BFARs and rationales for the requirements. Dean Taylor said the two paths, which represent the sub-committee's best sense about how to approach the task, will be assessed in the pilot project. Both approaches involve

¹ Report of the ad hoc Committee of Senate Executive to Examine Accommodation of Students with Disabilities and Governance Procedures Related to Academic Requirements (Senate, April 4, 2012)

developing learning outcomes as the basis for identifying BFARs at both the course and program levels, but one begins at the course level and works up to the program level and the other begins at the program level and works down to the course level. Dean Taylor contended that the development of learning outcomes and BFARs for courses is necessary in order to fully develop program BFARs.

Dean Taylor anticipated concerns that (i) the Cooper Commission Report had contemplated BFARs only for programs and not for courses and (ii) the Cooper Commission had not considered learning outcomes. He said the subcommittee had concluded, and the Working Group had concurred, that both learning outcomes and course-level BFARs are within the ambit of the recommendations of the Cooper Commission Report. To support this position, he referenced the Report itself. First, he noted that the definitions of “accommodation” and “modification,” found on pages 159 and 160 of the April 4, 2013 Senate agenda, respectively, reflect that both accommodations and modifications apply at both the course and program levels. Second, section 5 a.ii. of the Report (page 165 of the April 4, 2013 Senate agenda), which recommends the delegation of authority to make decisions on substitutions, recognizes that students seek accommodations at a variety of levels, including at the course level. Dean Taylor also observed that students register in courses in disciplines outside of their program of study that have been developed for other programs.

Dean Taylor referred members to the definitions of “learning outcomes” and “*bona fide* academic requirements” set out on page 107 of the agenda. He said the sub-committee had reasoned that, once members of a department or program had begun the process of determining BFARs, they would necessarily be involved in determining learning outcomes, as the latter is a subset of the former. Additionally, it seemed reasonable to begin at the broader level of learning outcomes and to narrow those down to BFARs, and to define these at both the course and program levels, as most acquisition of knowledge and skills occurs at the course level. Dean Taylor said the ultimate goal of the exercise is to serve students by making expectations as transparent and comprehensible as possible.

Professor Gabbert and Dean Whitmore, who had served as members of the Cooper Commission, noted that the committee had not discussed the possibility of establishing course level BFARs. Professor Gabbert said the committee also had not discussed learning outcomes. He recalled the circumstance that had caused the Cooper Commission to be struck, in which difficulties had arisen from the waiver of what many had considered to be an essential requirement of a particular doctoral program, a written comprehensive examination. Professor Gabbert said Legal Counsel had advised the Commission that, for the University to protect BFARs from requests for accommodation that entailed a waiver, it would be necessary to demonstrate that a department had considered why the requirement is essential and why it cannot be waived. Recognizing that the University is not prepared to respond to this type of

challenge, Senate had referred the matter to Senate Executive, which had, in turn, established an ad hoc committee to consider the matter.

Referring to comments that the Cooper Commission had not contemplated learning outcomes and learning objectives, Dr. Smith noted that the committee had been provided with resources on the development of learning outcomes at other institutions including Trent University and the University of Windsor. So the committee had been provided with context on learning outcomes. She acknowledged that, in its report, however, the Cooper Commission does speak about program BFARs. Dr. Smith said that staff in Student Accessibility Services and all students who request an accommodation would be better served if learning outcomes were examined and established for course and programs.

Members were generally supportive of establishing BFARs at the program level, noting it would be a reasonable and essential initiative. Several members, however, expressed the views that it is not necessary to begin by establishing learning outcomes for every course, or to develop learning outcomes for courses at all, in order to determine the BFARs for a program. Professor Gabbert said the question of whether the requirements that every 2000 level History course have a final examination that covers the entire term's work and constitutes at least 30 percent of the total course grade or that doctoral students must complete three written and oral comprehensive examinations in three areas of historical learning are BFARs does not require that the Department of History establish learning outcomes for every undergraduate and graduate course, respectively. He advocated for a process that would require departments to review their program requirements and discuss, in a collegial way, which requirements would never be waived. He noted that this could be done without looking at learning outcomes in every course in every curriculum.

Professor Gabbert contended that the question of whether or not to develop learning objectives is not a decision that is to be made by Senate and imposed on departments. Rather it is a pedagogical issue that is to be resolved by departments. He and others raised a concern that establishing learning outcomes for every course would negatively impact teaching by imposing narrow restrictions on the way faculty teach. Professor Desai remarked that learning outcomes are sometimes unexpected, as teaching and learning occurs not only in the classroom but also in hallways and during office hours. She expressed a concern that the love of teaching might be negatively impacted by a narrowly defined set of required learning objectives. Professors Brabston and Kucera described the proposal as an attempt to micromanage the way courses are delivered and predicted that it could infringe on academic freedom.

Referring to the definition of a BFAR, on page 107 of the agenda, Professor Hultin questioned how a BFAR could be both an "essential" and a "minimum" requirement. He proposed that a BFAR is either an essential or a minimum requirement, as there are skills and knowledge

that are essential but are not minimum and *vice versa*. He contended that the knowledge and skills that a student must acquire to successfully complete a course are outlined in the course syllabus. As course syllabi do not describe “essential and minimum requirements,” however, instructors are not compelled to evaluate every item on a syllabus and also have scope to cover special topics related to items included there. Professor Hultin asserted that it would not be possible to identify every essential component of a course. He suggested that creating lists of learning outcomes for courses might create an environment where students would challenge the fairness of an examination where an essential component was not covered or a question that did not depend on an essential requirement was included. He indicated that he would not want to teach in such an environment.

It was noted that there would be difficulties in identifying learning outcomes for some types of courses. Professor Kucera pointed to topics courses for which the course content varies from year to year, and Professor Gabbert cited multi-sectioned courses that are taught from different perspectives by various instructors.

Some members expressed concerns about the significant amount of effort and time that would be required to establish learning outcomes and BFARs for courses. Dean Whitmore observed that even an initiative to identify only program BFARs, if it were to be done well, would be a significant project. He proposed that, rather than creating course and program BFARs from the outset, a better approach would be to begin with program BFARs and, if the results prove to be beneficial, to proceed to the course level only if necessary.

Professor Prentice observed that academic programs are more than just the sum of courses and cautioned that attempting to reduce programs only to courses would be an unwise way to proceed. She noted that, in the context of the doctoral program in Sociology, students are required to complete course work but must also demonstrate competency in comprehensive examinations and produce a dissertation. She said there are students who successfully complete the required courses but cannot demonstrate overall competency in the subject matter. She worried that, if learning outcomes were identified at the course level, a student who had met only the course requirements might make a case that he or she was entitled to the degree.

Similarly, Dean Whitmore observed that, in some programs, essential skills and BFARs are not taught in one course but are developed as students apply and use those skills in several courses. For example, the ability to solve partial differential equations is an essential requirement for a B.Sc. in Physics but it is not a skill that is acquired in a single course. Given this, he raised a concern that requests for accommodation involving a course substitution might be complicated by the establishment of course level BFARs, which might imply that a BFAR that is actually distributed across a number of courses could be met by completing one of several courses.

Dr. Keselman thanked the Working Group for its work. She indicated that she supported the recommendation to undertake a pilot to evaluate the two proposed paths to BFARs saying that she accepted Dean Taylor's position that the proposal from the Working Group is consistent with recommendations made in the Cooper Commission Report. Dr. Keselman acknowledged that a program is not a sum of a set of courses and suggested that the Working Group would agree. She contended, however, that it is not possible to decouple courses from programs.

Dr. Keselman said departments and programs owe it to students to be able to articulate expectations for courses. Mr. Okeke concurred, remarking that learning objectives and expectations facilitate students' studies. He noted that instructors in the Faculty of Medicine provide learning objectives and outcomes for courses, which assist students in preparing for examinations, as they know what they are expected to learn in a course. Mr. Okeke suggested that a good instructor creates the final examination before the course starts so he or she can emphasize or focus his or her teaching on points that will be covered in the final examination. He said that, from a student perspective, the hallmark of a good instructor is one who has created explicit and well delineated learning objectives and outcomes for his or her course, which cover materials essential not only for passing the course but which are required for students to be successful in the next level of their program.

Professor Asadoorian noted that she is a member of the both the Working Group and the School of Dental Hygiene, which has established learning outcomes for courses and programs based on national competencies. She reasoned that BFARs based on learning outcomes at both the course and program levels are necessary to ensure that, and to be able to demonstrate that, the BFARs are not arbitrary. She noted that, in her experience as both a course coordinator and Director of the School, she had never heard faculty express concerns that establishing learning outcomes has restricted academic freedom.

Dean Taylor observed that, in courses offered by departments in the Faculty of Arts, often one-third of the students and sometimes as many as two-thirds of the students registered in the courses, are not registered in an Arts program. When these students request an accommodation it is for an accommodation at the course level. It is imperative, therefore, that departments have thought about course-level BFARs. Once departments begin to consider the essential skills and knowledge that are required, the discussion would necessarily involve learning outcomes. The best approach to identifying BFARs for a course is to begin by mapping out the learning outcomes (i.e., what students should have learned by the end of the course).

Dean Taylor maintained that, if the task of developing BFARs is to be done properly, it will be necessary to identify BFARs at both the program and course levels. He acknowledged that there is a possibility that, for some programs not subject to accreditation that are very prescriptive, it may be determined that program learning outcomes and BFARs will

easily map down to courses, in which case the program might decide not to complete the exercise at the course level. He said the Working Group might have a better sense of this once the pilot has been completed.

Dean Taylor agreed with Professor Prentice that a program is not simply a sum of its courses, as programs evolve over time and sometimes also incorporate transfer courses or prior learning that are mapped onto the requirements for a particular program. Thus, it would be disadvantageous to students if learning outcomes and BFARs were identified only at the course level.

Dean Taylor asserted that nothing about learning outcomes or learning expectations violates academic freedoms. He explained that learning outcomes and expectations would be identified through a collegial process within and department or program, for courses and programs. Faculty members would be free to teach the courses in the way they see fit, to get to those expectations. Dean Taylor noted that, in 2005, the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario developed program expectations for all undergraduate and graduate programs in that province. Every Ontario university has now developed university-level outcomes and most institutions are in the process of developing program-level outcomes. In response to a government of Ontario discussion paper last year, the Ontario Confederation of Faculty Associations recognized that, “[the] measurement of student outcomes is an important part of ensuring educational quality.”

Professor Gabbert called attention to the implication that there are problems with providing accommodations in a general way. He underscored that information provided to the Cooper Commission demonstrated that this is not the case, as there are established processes for managing requests for accommodation and most requests readily addressed without waiving an essential requirement. He reminded members that what is of concern are requests to waive requirements that, if they were granted, would undercut the integrity of an academic program. Professor MacPherson concurred adding that, considering the relatively small number of requirements that would be considered BFARs that could not be waived, and given the very small number of students, in any given year, who would seek an accommodation involving the waiver of a BFAR, he suggested that asking departments and programs to identify learning outcomes and BFARs for every course might not be time well spent.

Referring to the Implementation Plan Framework for the Cooper Commission Report, in the agenda of the May 16, 2012 Senate agenda, Professor John Anderson noted a recommendation that members of the Cooper Commission remain available to the Working Group and Senate Executive in an advisory capacity. He proposed that members of the Cooper Commission might be consulted before the Implementation Working Group makes its final recommendation to Senate Executive and Senate.

Observing that several units had volunteered to participate, the Chair noted that the pilot project would proceed and that Senate would have a subsequent opportunity to discuss the matter at the conclusion of the project. Mr. Leclerc suggested that the pilot project offered an opportunity to gather more information about the work involved in establishing learning outcomes and BFARs, which would ultimately inform the Working Group's recommendation to Senate.

In response to a question, Dean Taylor said it would be premature to disclose the programs that have volunteered to participate in the pilot project, as approvals within the academic units might be pending. Dean Beddoes disclosed that the Faculty of Engineering had volunteered enthusiastically.

Ms. Gottheil informed members that it was the last Senate meeting at which Dr. Smith would be in attendance, as she would be retiring from the University. She thanked Dr. Smith for her service as Co-chair of the Cooper Commission Implementation Working Group and for the many significant contributions that she has made during her tenure at the University. This was met with a round of applause.

4. **In Memoriam: Dr. Norman Frohlich** Page 112

Professor Brabston offered a tribute to Dr. Norman Frohlich who she remembered as a great scholar and a great individual who had welcomed her to the Faculty of Commerce when she first joined the University. She recalled his academic contributions, as evidenced by his having been published in leading journals, his significant contributions to the University community through his service on committees, and his dedication to quality education and scholarship through his work with quality students and faculty. She expressed her hope that Dr. Frohlich would be remembered with fondness and respect.

5. **In Memoriam: Dr. Elizabeth Feniak** Page 113

6. **In Memoriam: Dr. Dana Stewart** Page 114

7. **Items Approved by the Board of Governors, on June 25, 2013** Page 115

IV **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT** Page 117

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 Phil Hultin, Faculty of Science.

I would be interested to hear a response to the following question at the Sept 4 Senate meeting.

The University's new policy on electronic communications includes the compulsory use of "Myumanitoba.ca" email accounts in communicating with students. Given that these accounts are managed by Microsoft and are essentially an extension of the old Hotmail system, and given that we now know that all emails passing through this service are routinely monitored by security agencies of the United States government, how can we be assured of the confidentiality of our correspondence with our students?

Mr. Kochan remarked that no email system can guarantee confidentiality. Based on research into different options available he expressed confidence that the new system, Office 365, provides more assurance of confidentiality than the previous system (cc@umanitoba.ca), which had been based on open architecture. Mr. Kochan informed members that the use of Office 365 for student email at the University had undergone a Privacy Impact Assessment to ensure compliance with privacy legislation and privacy best practices. The project had been reviewed and deemed to be in compliance with The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA). He said Microsoft is provided with only the minimum amount of personal information on students, which includes name and email address. No other student information is shared with Microsoft. Microsoft offers substantial security provisions for Office 365 and their system meets reasonable security standards under FIPPA. Microsoft, along with all email providers, including Gmail, Yahoo, Shaw, Rogers, and many other email services used by the public are all required to comply with jurisdictional legislation, including Canadian and/or United States law. The privacy risk to students using Office 365 had been determined to be no greater than when using other email systems. Mr. Kochan noted that, due to limitations of the previous student email system, most students forwarded their @cc.umanitoba account to their own personal email which could be to any provider in any country. The new systems provide consistency. Mr. Kochan noted, in addition, that the Access and Privacy Office had not received any complaints regarding the new email system and that Office 365 does not link to any other university systems that house personal information of students.

Mr. Kochan noted that the user of the system is deemed to be the custodian of the content and students are informed about appropriate use of email and must agree to the University usage policy. Students are advised that it is not considered appropriate to email sensitive personal information including health information. Students are also notified that their email is held in another jurisdiction. Mr. Kochan said that, were a student to request opting out of the system, the University would look to provide an alternative. Mr. Kochan said that, as of September 4th, 9,400 accounts had been activated on @myumanitoba and it is expected that 10,000 accounts would be activated by the end of the week.

Mr. Kochan reported that a survey of Canadian University CIO's on cloud email service, showed an even split on those who have moved to the cloud (with Google or Microsoft) and those that continue to host the service internally. Institutions using cloud email services include the University of Ottawa, the University of Muncton, the University of New Brunswick, the University of Alberta, and the University of Winnipeg, which has also implemented Microsoft's Office365.

The following question was submitted by Professor Kucera, UMFA Assessor:

The model for the proposed new Faculty of Health Sciences has a number of colleges in its structure that represent existing faculties such as Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, and Pharmacy but not Human Ecology. It appears that the Faculty of Human Ecology will no longer exist in any form and that the intention appears to be that the academic staff in Human Ecology will be relocated to other faculties.

Section 34(1) (l) of the University of Manitoba Act states that senate shall: "recommend to the board the establishment of, or the abolition of, or any changes in faculties, constituent colleges, schools, institutes, departments, chairs, lectureships, bursaries, scholarships, fellowships and prizes:"

What is the process that Senate will use regarding making a recommendation to the Board of Governors on the future of the Faculty of Human Ecology? When will this matter be considered? Will there be an opportunity for direct input from members of the Faculty of Human Ecology regarding their concerns about the future?

Dr. Keselman recalled that a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences (dated April 9, 2013) posted online describes several options for new structural alignments that were being, and continue to be, explored by members of the Faculty of Human Ecology. The options include opportunities within Human Ecology and with other units. Dr. Keselman confirmed that the current proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences does not include the Faculty of Health Sciences. She indicated that, at present, any proposals that might involve the Faculty of Human Ecology or departments within it are not fully developed. Any proposed changes to the structure of the Faculty of Human Ecology would be advanced to Senate and the Board of Governors, following consideration by the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Human Ecology.

Professor Kucera said UMFA is concerned that departments with the Faculty of Human Ecology had been asked to consider various possibilities about how departments might be dispersed to other units without any discussion about what plans are for the Faculty as a whole, including the option that it might continue with its current structure. He noted that, despite the lack of clarity regarding the future structure of the Faculty, students continued to be admitted to Human Ecology this fall.

Dr. Keselman informed members that the Faculty of Human Ecology had been exploring its future within the University's organizational structure well before the Academic Structure Initiative was initiated, as departments within the Faculty have significant collaborations with units in other faculties that are stronger than those between departments in Human Ecology. She said she understands from discussions with the Dean and department heads that the heads are pursuing options outside of Human Ecology that they feel would be useful to their units for developing teaching and research programs. Those discussions are ongoing and no proposals have been developed at this point in time.

VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JUNE 19, 2013

Referring to the fourth sentence of the first full paragraph on page 9, Professor Gabbert said he had not intended to imply that individuals who are not Senators should not be permitted to speak to the proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences. He clarified that his intent was to point out that, if there should be guests who are slated to speak, time must be allowed for Senators to fully discuss the proposal. He indicated that he would send revised wording to the Recording Secretary.

Professor Gabbert MOVED, seconded by Professor Kinsner, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on June 19, 2013 be approved as amended.

CARRIED

The Chair remarked that it will be important to clarify, from the outset, how the discussion of the proposal would proceed when it is considered by Senate. He indicated that he and the University Secretary had drafted rules to govern the proceedings, which would be discussed by Senate Executive at its meeting in October.

VII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures

The Chair informed members that the Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures had been approved by the President and are available in their final form on the University Governance webpage.

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

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Page 130

Professor Anderson reported that Senate Executive met on August 21, 2013. Comments of the committee accompany the reports upon which they are made.

Professor Anderson reported that the committee had approved a request from Mr. Leclerc and Dr. Smith, Co-Chairs of the Cooper Commission Implementation Working Group, to appoint Ms. Brandy Usick (Director, Student Advocacy), as a Co-Chair of the Implementation Working Group, effective September 1, 2013. Ms. Usick will take over the role from Dr. Smith (Executive Director, Student Services / Student Affairs), who is retiring from the University.

Professor Anderson said the committee had made recommendations on nominations to fill two vacancies for student representatives on the Senate Committee on Nominations.

Professor Anderson MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the following nominations to the Senate Committee on Nominations be approved by Senate for one-year terms effective immediately and ending on May 31, 2014:

- Mr. Hooman Derakhshani (graduate student)
- Mr. Astitwa Thapa (undergraduate student).

CARRIED

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

The Chair noted that Ms. Ducas, Chair of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee, had sent regrets for the meeting. He reported that the committee had concluded its deliberations on one proposal and would provide a report on that proposal at the October Senate meeting.

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

**1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards
Part B - June 20, 2013** Page 133

Professor Hultin said the Senate Committee on Awards is recommending that Senate approve the establishment of an award, which might be deemed as potentially discriminatory, given the committee's evaluation that there are justifiable grounds. He explained that the proposed award is targeted to increase the number of women in Engineering. He called attention to a letter of support from Dean Beddoes, Faculty of Engineering.

Professor Hultin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [dated June 20, 2013].

CARRIED

**2. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards
Part B -August 7, 2013** Page 137

Professor Hultin said the committee is recommending that Senate approve several new and revised award offers directed specifically to Aboriginal students in the I.H. Asper School of Business based on its assessment that there are legitimate grounds for doing so.

Professor Hultin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [dated August 7, 2013].

CARRIED

**3. Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations
[August 1, 2013]** Page 145

Professor Edwards indicated that nominations had been received to fill vacancies on a number of standing committees. There were no further nominations.

Professor Edwards MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated August 1, 2013].

CARRIED

4. Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Dress

Page 146

Professor Embree MOVED, seconded by Dean Dawe, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Dress.

CARRIED

X ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 14, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 147, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on September 4, 2013.