



**Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors**  
**Open Session**  
**March 20, 2012**

---

The meeting was held at 4:00 p.m. in the Alan A. Borger Sr. Executive Conference Room, E1-270 EITC.

Present: J. Lederman, Chair  
J. Leclerc, University Secretary

D. Barnard    A. Berg        T. Bock        P. Bovey        E. Bowness    R. Dhalla  
M. Forsen    N. Halden      G. Hatch      M. Labine      P. Nawrot      B. Passey  
N. Rashid    M. Robertson D. Sauer      H. Secter      C. Tapp        M. Whitmore  
R. Zegalski

Assessors Present:

B. McKenzie

Regrets:

J. Embree    R. Howard    S. Jasper

Officials Present:

J. Doering    S. Foster      S. Gottheil    D. Jayas      J. Kearsey    J. Keselman  
D. McCallum

1.     **Announcements**

Ms. Lederman welcomed Bilan Arte, President-elect of UMSU and Jennifer Black, Vice-President (Advocacy)-elect of UMSU. Ms. Lederman then welcomed Susan Gottheil, Vice-Provost (Students), who would be presenting to the Board of Governors, and Jay Doering, Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

2.     **PRESENTATION**

SEM Update, Susan Gottheil, Vice-Provost (Students)

Ms. Gottheil presented an update of the status of the Strategic Enrolment Management process at the University of Manitoba.

A number of questions were asked by members of the Board:

Dr. McKenzie asked whether the projected numbers include Distance Education or Online Learning. Ms. Gottheil responded that they are included, but are not broken down. The projections are global, so online and distance education programs will need to be looked at. Ms. Lederman asked Dr. Barnard to speak to where this fits in relation to the overall planning and decision making framework to set the context for the discussion.

Dr. Barnard stated that the University has not consciously tried to manage enrolment in the past. He added that more graduate students and more Indigenous students are needed in order to serve the province's needs, particularly as they relate to economy and innovation. Graduate students are tied into the innovation agenda in countries that are trying to grow. He then stated that key decisions needed to be made about what we want the enrolment profile to look like, and that these decisions will result in various entailments. He suggested that feedback from Board members would be helpful to the Executive team in initially determining those targets. He indicated that it seemed to make sense to move toward a target of 32,000 students as this would allow room to grow some of the components we wish to grow without turning away students from our local area. A totally different strategy, Dr. Barnard offered, would be to stay at the same size and grow those components which we think should grow. This alternative would mean that some local students would have to be turned away as we would reduce our domestic undergraduate intake. There may be good reason to do it, but there would be risks as well. We could lose ground to our competitors. We could give away a market that we owned in order to pursue a market that we can't effectively pursue. The proportion of graduate, international, and Indigenous students is the issue we need to look at today.

Dr. Keselman indicated that this project began as a component part of the OARS project, to strive to use our resources effectively. If the University brings in any students who come to the door and those students don't succeed and leave; that is not a very good use of resources. It is a move from recruiting by chance to recruiting by choice and recruiting to retain with a focus on student success. The question is, what choice does the University make, what kind of institution do we say we are and what does that mean for the choices we make. This translates into what actions we take around the kind of students we think are best suited for our university – how many and what numbers, and then get into the bigger question of overall goals.

Ms. Bovey asked what percentage of graduate students did their undergraduate degree at the University of Manitoba and how many graduated elsewhere. Dr. Doering responded that he did not have exact numbers at hand but he suspected it was approximately a 50/50 split.

Chancellor Sexter stated that this issue may be more difficult and potentially dangerous than it appears to be. If this plan were implemented it would only work if we were to shrink the existing non-Aboriginal, non-international student body. His sense is that, from a political point of view, if the University of Manitoba is seen as not accommodating local, non-Indigenous students, the government may decide that those students should be accommodated elsewhere and would likely adjust post-secondary funding accordingly. It's potentially self-defeating. Some of the issues are very nuanced and the potential unintended consequences may be very significant for

the future of this institution. Dr. Barnard responded that this was a very good point, although he noted that more Indigenous students would mean more Manitoba students. However, he asked, are those we are admitting at the low end of the mark range being successful? The University's policy has been to accept everyone, but without consideration of whether or not they are successful. The University may not be serving people well by letting those individuals fail out. Dr. Sexter suggested that a medical/doctoral university might be justified, as part of a Manitoba University System, in redirecting those students to other institutions. Dr. Sexter indicated his sense that this type of idea had not been well received by government in the past, but that it may be time to revisit it as part of an overall provincial system. Dr. Barnard stated that, in reality, in recent history, funding has not been tied to student enrolment, so any government preferences have not been stated or operationalized.

Dr. Whitmore asked how the students do in general. How successful are they? If success is defined as graduating, does it vary with the incoming average? He stated that, of those students coming in with low marks, only 30% appear to graduate.

Ms. Lederman asked if there is any awareness of the way the province is impacted by a low number of graduate students being trained. The province would need to know this information in order to make their funding decisions. Dr. Barnard indicated his sense that this was not generally well understood. Ms. Bovey stated that in her experience with hiring employees she has at time found it necessary to hire individuals from out of province because of a lack of qualified local graduates. She added that this phenomenon likely plays out sector by sector.

Dr. Keselman stated that there would have to be an acknowledgement that the University of Manitoba plays a unique role in the province. The University would be fulfilling what it has always said the mandate is, but it hinges on the public and the other institutions accepting this. Mr. Robertson asked why, as an institution, we would want a higher percentage of graduate students. Dr. Keselman responded that graduate students are the engine of the research enterprise and that our research programs suffer because of insufficient numbers of graduate students. Dr. Jayas stated that a knowledge economy requires graduates with both Masters and Doctorate level degrees, referring to the work of Richard Florida. If Manitobans want to live in a knowledge economy the University needs to produce the graduates to support it and meet the needs of the province.

Ms. Labine asked if the number of graduate students who stay in the province is known and whether there are positions for these graduates in the province. Dr. Doering responded that there is no evidence that the majority of Ph.D.'s aren't employed up to their skill level. Because Manitoba has been kicking below its weight it is not surprising that employers must go outside of our borders for qualified people. If we produce the graduates, they will be absorbed into a global knowledge economy. Dr. Whitmore observed that top faculty are attracted to thriving research programs with sufficient graduate students. Also, a strong graduate research program supports the inclusion of research opportunities in the undergraduate curriculum.

Dr. McKenzie suggested that though there is a need to grow graduate enrolment, if that is done at the expense of the undergraduate population it may play against another priority which is to increase the number of undergraduate Indigenous students. This needs to be given careful thought. Dr. Barnard replied that he feels that both can be accomplished at the same time. The University would explicitly target increasing the number of graduate and undergraduate Indigenous students while increasing the overall number and proportion of graduate students and international students. Dr. Barnard stated that it will be a hard job to get to where the profile of students at the university represents the percentage of Indigenous people in Manitoba's population. There is quite a bit of room to grow, but both can be done at the same time.

Ms. Tapp noted that the increase in international students does have some impact. Specifically that these students are the main users of advocacy services and the appeals process. She added that if the students come here and are not successful that it is a waste of efforts and resources. She added that students already have limited spaces in which to live and work and stated that more residences are needed in order to support these students.

Dr. Barnard noted that Ms. Gottheil did not elaborate on all of the entailments associated with these decisions, and added that those types of things would be considered later in the process. Dr. Barnard stated that the undergraduate/graduate balance that we want to have and the proportion of international and Indigenous students combined with how big we want to be leads to all kinds of considerations from which flow derived decisions.

Mr. Dhalla stated that funding seems to be a big part of these decisions, adding that graduate students are expensive. He suggested that online learning should be part of the SEM plan and that the Board should have a better understanding of costs associated with each student and ways to reduce costs by considering, as a mitigating factor, online and distance learning opportunities for undergraduate students. Ms. Gottheil responded that it was necessary to be careful about viewing online education as a panacea. Students who currently enroll in these courses often don't have a good success rate, and Ms. Gottheil added that there are instructor and infrastructure costs making distance learning expensive to provide. What might be good to look into are course-based masters programs. She added that some programs are more expensive than others and that it is important to let some programs subsidize others. Ms. Lederman noted that online education should be part of the consideration as one element in the toolbox. Some institutions have had great success with it. She also stated that it would be helpful to see data on the impact of the lack of graduate students in the province. This institution needs to understand that better so that government and citizens can understand it.

Ms. Bovey noted that when community colleges became degree granting institutions in British Columbia a number of students transferred to the University of Victoria after their first two years in community college. She asked if there will be another mix of feeder students coming to the University of Manitoba as society changes in the next few years. Will there be feeders from Red River College and University College of the North that will be coming to this university after their 3rd and 4th years. Dr. Barnard responded that those feeders will be coming into the mix, and added that there is a lot of interest in student mobility among the public and government.

Finally, Dr. Barnard stated that the discussion had been helpful and that he sensed that there was no great disagreement with the direction discussed and that the general direction seems okay. Ms. Lederman added that any changes in direction must come with the caveat that the government would have to be involved in discussions. Dr. Jayas suggested that we should study countries like Israel where they have moved into a knowledge economy to get a better case to show to the government.

Ms. Lederman thanked Ms. Gottheil and Dr. Doering for the discussion and invited Board members to have a ten minute break before starting the formal part of the agenda.

### 3. **Approval of the Agenda**

It was moved by Ms. Forsen and seconded by Mr. Nawrot:

**THAT the agenda for the March 20, 2012 Open Session be approved as circulated.**

**CARRIED**

### **FOR APPROVAL**

### 4. **MINUTES (Open Session)**

4.1 Approval of the Minutes for the January 19, 2012 meeting as circulated or amended

It was moved by Ms. Bovey and seconded by Mr. Nawrot:

**THAT the minutes of the January 19, 2012 meeting be approved as circulated.**

**CARRIED**

4.2 Business arising – none

### 5. **UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGENDA**

The Chair asked whether any member had concern with any of the items on the Consent Agenda. Dr. McKenzie requested that item 7.4 New Policy - Safe Disclosure be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion.

It was moved by Mr. Nawrot and seconded by Ms. Forsen that the Board of Governors approve and/or receive for information the following:

7.1 Interim Spending Guidelines for 2012-2013

**THAT the Board of Governors authorize interim spending guidelines based on 97% of the current 2011-12 baseline operating budget from April 1, 2012 until the Board of Governors approves the 2012-13 operating budget.**

7.5 New Substance Abuse and/or Dependency Policy

**THAT the Board of Governors**

**1) rescind the current Policy: Alcoholism of University Staff (February 17, 1977);**

**2) approve the new Policy: Substance Abuse and/or Dependency; and**

**3) receive for information the Procedures: Substance Abuse and/or Dependency previously approved by the President.**

7.6 Revised Art Collection Policy

**THAT the Board of Governors approve the revised Art Collections Policy and accept for information the Art Collections Procedures.**

7.7 Revised Holidays Policy

**THAT the Board of Governors approve the revised Holidays Policy.**

8.1 Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated December 15, 2011]

**THAT the Board of Governors approve sixteen new offers and one amended offer as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated December 15, 2011].**

8.2 Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated January 18, 2012] and [dated January 25, 2012]

**THAT the Board of Governors approve one new offer and three amended offers as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated January 18, 2012].**

**THAT the Board of Governors approve one amended offer as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated January 25, 2012].**

**CARRIED**

The Board received for information the following:

11.1 University Discipline Committee Annual Report

Report of the University Disciplinary Committee for the period of September 1, 2010 to August 31, 2011

**6. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT**

Dr. Barnard highlighted a few items from his written report, including a recent trip to Berlin he was on with Ralph Stern and U15 presidents to meet with presidents of research universities there, as well as will some of the funding agencies. He added that, prior to the trip to Berlin he and Dean Stern had visited the Technical University in Munich to sign some collaborative agreements. Additionally, Dr. Barnard indicated he has been the lead negotiator for AUCC in negotiations with the Access Copyright group. Dr. Barnard then congratulated John Kearsley's team on the success of the Trailblazer campaign which won 8 awards in Seattle at the CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education) awards in recognition of the brand campaign.

Dr. Barnard reported that the Visionary Conversations events have been ongoing for the last number of months, and recently were styled as Alumni events in Victoria and Vancouver. He added that these were the best alumni events he's ever attended at any university, attendance was fantastic and there was significant interest in the human rights topic as addressed by Professors Adam Muller, Chris Powell and Karen Busby. These events will be held again in other places as well.

**7. FROM FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

7.2 2012-2013 Residence Room and Meal Plan Rate

Mr. Zegalski stated that this annual submission was discussed at length and recommended by the Finance, Administration, and Human Resources (FAHR) Committee. He added that the goal was to keep rates as affordable as possible while addressing increased costs in utilities, food, etc., making it a tough decision every year.

Mr. Sauer asked what was meant by the statement at the bottom of page 27, that the cost of going green is increasing. Mrs. McCallum explained that part of the Sustainability strategy requires Aramark to develop more sustainable strategies, such as composting and improving packaging.

Also referring to page 27, Ms. Tapp reported that students are unhappy about the external declining balance program. Mrs. McCallum explained the rationale behind that program and stated that vendors require some guarantee of business in return for offering the program. The mandatory \$100.00 on the card is designed to provide that guarantee.

It was moved by Mr. Zegalski and seconded by Mr. Robertson:

**THAT the Board of Governors approve the room and meal plan rate increases for 2012-13 for the Arthur V. Mauro Residence, Mary Speechly Hall, Pembina Hall Residence, and University College Residence as detailed in the tables attached.**

**CARRIED**

*Ms. Tapp requested that her opposition be recorded.*

### 7.3 Endowment Fund – Policy on Spending Allocations

Mr. Zegalski reported that as returns on investment funds are not what they have been in the past, the Trust and Investment Committee has analyzed allocation models used by other organizations in developing the proposed policy. The intention is to preserve endowments for future students while at the same time providing sufficient current funding. Mrs. McCallum added that there was consultation with the Deans in developing this policy as they are the primary beneficiaries of these spending allocations. She also stated that Lance McKinley had presented to the Provost Council and to faculty business managers to solicit feedback on the proposed model. The consensus reached was that this model would be the most stable for funding and the most resistant to market volatility.

It was moved by Mr. Zegalski and seconded by Dr. Whitmore:

**THAT the Board of Governors approve a new policy on endowment spending allocations effective the 2012/2013 fiscal year utilizing a hybrid of inflationary increases and market returns as follows: 75% based on the previous year's actual spending amount adjusted for inflation PLUS 25% based on a 4% spending rate of the 60-month rolling average of the market value of the fund.**

**CARRIED**

### 7.4 New Policy - Safe Disclosure

This policy was recommended by the Audit and Risk Management Committee (ARMC) subject to feedback from the University of Manitoba Faculty Association (UMFA), which had not yet been received. Since the policy was reviewed by ARMC there have been some revisions made to the procedures in response to comments from UMFA received on March 13. Mrs. McCallum added that this policy is an overdue response to a legislative requirement so delaying approval at that time had not been advisable.

Dr. McKenzie stated that UMFA appreciated that changes were made and pleased that they had an opportunity to comment. Dr. McKenzie noted that in Section 2.3 of the Policy it states that mandatory disclosure and reasonable cooperation with investigation is required. He added that the Act does not require mandatory reporting, and asked if the intent is that someone who does not report or disclose will be subject to discipline. In addition, Dr. McKenzie inquired as to the definition of credible evidence. Mrs. McCallum responded that decision had been to make the policy more broad because it is intended to as a risk management tool. She added that administration would likely give staff the benefit of the doubt except in the case of a very clear violation, stating that it was very unlikely that any disciplinary action would be taken for failure to report wrongdoing. The intent was to send a strong message that people are obligated to bring these issues forward. Dr. McKenzie suggested that it would be nicer to encourage and facilitate disclosure rather than making it mandatory. Regarding Section 2.6.5b) of the procedures, Dr. McKenzie asked what is the essential nature of an allegation against a person and stated that it might it be better to have full disclosure rather than only the essential nature of the allegation. Mrs. McCallum responded that she would look into the answer to that question and will let Dr. McKenzie know.

It was moved by Ms. Bovey and seconded by Mr. Zegalski:

**THAT the new policy entitled *Safe Disclosure* be approved.**

**CARRIED**

#### 7.8 Revised Parking Regulations

Mr. Zegalski informed the Board that FAHR had a presentation by Alan Simms outlining the event day parking plan, noting that there will be challenges and that some adjustments may be necessary. He added that these are the best plans to accommodate as many people as possible and that the FAHR Committee recommended approval. He also observed that there would be very little conflict with the Blue Bomber game schedule. Dr. Whitmore asked if the proposal was the same as that presented at Provost Council, stating that the Dean of Music had expressed some concerns related to the Preparatory Studies program. Mrs. McCallum reported that there had been some other concerns but they are being dealt with as they are raised. Ms. Tapp stated she recognized the difficulty in developing this plan, but reported that students are unhappy with having restrictions on their access to campus and that they weren't consulted before the plan was developed.

Mr. Bowness stated that there was a rumour that classes would be cancelled on game days. Mrs. McCallum stated that was not the case. Ms. Black asked whether there was room for negotiation and Mrs. McCallum replied that there was none and reminded the Board of the extensive benefits the University is receiving as result of the stadium being built on campus.

It was moved by Mr. Zegalski and seconded Ms. Bovey by

**THAT the Board of Governors approves revisions to the Parking Regulations to reflect new parking rules that form part of the Stadium Event Day Plan. The new Parking Regulations would take effect immediately upon approval.**

**CARRIED**

#### 7.9 Exclusive Suppliers & Administrative Systems Policy



Mr. Zegalski stated that the policy provides efficiency and that many other institutions and governments are looking at implementing similar policies.

Mrs. McCallum added that in order for the University to receive the benefits negotiated in exclusive supplier agreements, full adoption is essential by members of the University, therefore, participation is a mandatory requirement. This policy is the mechanism to ensure compliance. Dr. Whitmore offered the example of a grant from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) where a researcher found a lower price available from a different supplier but had to go through the University's preferred supplier. He noted that this may cost granting agencies more in some cases. Mrs. McCallum stated that on large ticket items the University goes out to tender and that sole supplier contracts are usually for smaller items. She added that from time to time there will be individual prices elsewhere that will be lower, but in totality, pricing on average will benefit the University.

It was moved by Mr. Zegalski and seconded by Ms. Forsen:

**THAT the Board of Governors approve the new policy entitled *Exclusive Suppliers and Administrative Systems*.**

**CARRIED**

## **FOR INFORMATION**

### **FROM FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

9.1 Financial results and annual projection for the quarter Ending December 31, 2011

9.2 Interim Southwoods Lands Use Plan

### **10. UPDATES**

10.1 Updates from the UMSU President & GSA President

Ms. Tapp reported that UMSU participated in a national Day of Action on February 1 in which a large number of students participated. Ms. Tapp then acknowledged the support from university administration in creating the skating rink which was very active this year. Also, she reported that students were happy that improvements to campus wireless service are progressing and that there will be 29 wireless hubs in University Centre. She added that UMSU elections have taken place and that it was exciting to see a large number of students engaged in governance. Regarding construction of the Hub, Ms. Tapp reported that there had been some setbacks but construction was still moving along and it would be opening relatively soon. Finally, she noted that it was the last Board of Governors meeting for herself and Nour Rashid and expressed her thanks to everyone on the Board, stating that she loved the experience and wished the incoming UMSU executives well. The Chair responded with thanks from the Board and from management for their contributions over the year.

Mr. Nawrot reported that the GSA office and lounge renovations were completed, adding his thanks that the Dean of Medicine had provided a lounge at Brodie Centre for graduate students with secure card access. Mr. Nawrot added that on March 29 Minister Selby would be coming for a breakfast meeting with graduate students and administrators to talk about the province's strategies and he hoped to make it a yearly event. Mr. Nawrot informed the Board that GSA did not participate in the national Day of Action because many graduate students were not in

agreement with proposals by the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) to protest/lobby tuition fees and such.

Mr. Nawrot stated that the Income Tax office at the International Centre for students was not provided this year so many students were having difficulty in filing their tax returns, in part because graduate students cannot access the UMSU tax office for service. He expressed his hope that the GSA lounge could be booked for the month of March to bring in a tax service from the city as it is something the students want.

Mr. Nawrot then went on the report that the Annual General Meeting was held on February 2 and that graduate students voted in favour of hiring a researcher to work in the office and look into the relationship of GSA with CFS. He added that there had been some activity which calls into question the status of the GSA membership in CFS and that graduate students wanted assurance that their fees were being used appropriately. Mr. Nawrot suggested that this may result in a motion to cease collecting CFS membership fees.

It was moved by Ms. Bovey and seconded by Mr. Zegalski:

**THAT the meeting move into Closed & Confidential Session**

**CARRIED**

---

**Chair**

---

**University Secretary**