



UNIVERSITY  
OF MANITOBA

**Minutes of the OPEN Session of the  
Board of Governors  
March 18, 2014**

---

Present: P. Bovey, Chair  
J. Leclerc, Secretary

S. Ally      D. Barnard      A. Berg      T. Bock      R. Dhalla (phone)      J. Embree  
N. Halden      M. Labine      J. Lederman      B. Passey      M. Robertson      S. Senkbeil  
A. Turnbull      M. Wetzel      M. Whitmore      R. Zegalski

Regrets: A. Dansen      R. Howard      S. Jesseau      D. Sauer      H. Secter

Assessors Present: C. Morrill

Officials Present: S. Foster      D. Jayas      J. Kearsey      J. Keselman      P. Kochan  
A. Konowalchuk

Also Present: G. Cibinel

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair congratulated Mr. Turnbull on being re-elected as President of the University of Manitoba Students' Union. She also welcomed Mr. George Cibinel, who was present to speak to the Bannatyne Campus Master Plan.

**FOR ACTION**

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

It was moved by Ms. Senkbeil and seconded by Mr. Robertson:

**THAT the agenda for the Open session of the March 18, 2014 Board of Governors meeting be approved as circulated.**

**CARRIED**

3. MINUTES (Open Session)

3.1 Approval of the Minutes of the January 28, 2014 OPEN Session as circulated or amended

It was moved by Ms. Wetzel and seconded by Dr. Whitmore:

**THAT the minutes of the Open session of the January 28, 2014 meeting be approved as circulated.**

**CARRIED**

3.2 Business Arising – none

**4. UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGENDA**

The Chair asked whether any member had concern with any of the items on the Consent Agenda. No items were identified to be removed from the Consent Agenda.

It was moved by Mr. Robertson and seconded by Ms. Passey:

**That the Board of Governors approve and/or receive for information the following:**

- 6.1 THAT a \$3.66 per credit hour contribution be assessed against the students in the Faculty of Pharmacy for a three year term commencing in the fall of 2014 as outlined in the letter from Neal Davies, Dean, Faculty of Pharmacy, dated January 17, 2014.**
- 7.1 THAT the Board of Governors approve three new offers, one amended offer, and the withdrawal of one offer, as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated December 16, 2013].**
- 7.2 THAT the Board of Governors approve three new offers, three amended offers, and the withdrawal of one offer, as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated January 21, 2014].**

The Board received the following for information (from Senate):

- 8.1 Report of the University Disciplinary Committee for the period of September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013**
- 8.2 Statement of Intent: Master of Dentistry (M.Dent.) in Prosthodontics**

**CARRIED**

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

**5.1 REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT**

In addition to his written report included in the meeting materials, Dr. Barnard reported on the provincial budget which had been released since the last Board meeting. He informed the Board that the University would receive a 2.5% operating grant increase and that there would be some modest adjustments on tuition fees. He noted that he was pleased with the good relationship the University has with the provincial government.

Dr. Barnard commented on the recent event with Dr. Neal Degrasse Tyson who spoke last week to the biggest ever audience in the Investors Group Athletic Centre. He remarked that it

was an amazing success and congratulated those who had worked on it, including Brendan Hughes, Executive Director of Student Experience and his team, among many others.

Ms. Senkbeil asked the President for his opinion about the recently announced change moving COPSE into the Department of Education and Advanced Learning. Dr. Barnard said that he was happy with the decision, noting that the distance that had existed between the Council and the Minister was not helpful so bringing it closer will help. He added that its function will be similar, but it will report directly to the Minister and should lead to faster and more consistent interactions.

Dr. Whitmore asked whether there was a summary available of the provincial budget. Dr. Barnard replied that there had been one prepared by the Government and Community Relations office and that he would arrange for distribution to Board members.

## 6. FROM FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION, & HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

### 6.2 Student Organizations Fees Policy

Mr. Zegalski stated that the Committee is recommending this policy in effort to address some past situations with student groups. Mr. Leclerc added that the policy addresses recommendations from Audit Services and streamlines processes. Mr. Dhalla asked if this would mean that student groups would no longer require annual audits. Mr. Leclerc responded that the recommendation came from Audit Services to no longer require external audits as the audits offered little value at significant cost. He added that if this policy is approved, oversight and control will move from the University to UMSU and UMSU will have sign off responsibility. Additionally, Mr. Leclerc noted that UMSU would be able to hold funds if a situation warranted such action.

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

**THAT the Board of Governors approve the Student Organization Fees Policy, effective April 1, 2014, and rescind the Policy “Student Organizations”, last revised June 21, 2011.**

**CARRIED**

### 6.3 2014-2015 Residence Room & Meal Plan Rates

Mr. Zegalski stated that this item comes annually for the Board to review and approve. He noted that Administration provided solid background and rationale for the proposed increases and that the Committee had discussed and debated this at length. He explained that the issue is that the actual cost of maintaining the residences is not reflected in the fees charged and this may be the opportunity to address that.

Mr. Kochan added that the proposed increase covers the cost of inflation but not the real cost of providing the service so the University is still losing money on the residences. He commented that there was a fine balance between remaining competitive in the market and covering costs.



Ms. Senkbeil noted that the residences do not fall under the Residential Tenancies Act and asked what increase would be allowed if the Act did apply. She also asked whether students could appeal the increase as they would be able to do so if the Act applied.

Mr. Dhalla asked whether there had been any discussion of how well used the food services are and whether students were left with unused food credits at the end of the year. Mr. Turnbull commented that meal plan rates are an issue for students and that he has heard anecdotally that some students still have a large amount to spend at the end of the school year. His sense is that students would prefer smaller amounts that can be topped up if necessary. Mr. Turnbull suggested that this issue should be discussed well before the rate increase proposal comes to the Board next year. Ms. Bovey asked that more background information be provided as well.

Ms. Senkbeil stated that to her mind, tuition money and government funding should not be used to subsidize housing for students. She suggested tabling this matter until the Board can understand what the numbers look like from a business model perspective, and asked when the rates must be approved? Dr. Barnard remarked that this is an important discussion about a valuable service provided to students and the conversation must be given sufficient time and attention. He added that the meal plans are tied into commitments with the food supplier and that there are many different forces in play. Regarding Ms. Senkbeil's suggestion that the matter be tabled, Dr. Barnard indicated that tabling the item would cause a difficult delay in the promotions and planning for the fall term. He suggested that the requested information can be provided and a full discussion can ensue from that for the following year.

Ms. Labine agreed that putting together a plan with historical data and projecting forward would be the best way to build a long-term strategy. She suggested looking at the issue from both the financial aspect and the campus life perspective, adding that this may be a concern at the Bannatyne campus in the future as well. Ms. Bovey stated that this is clearly a complex question with many angles to consider and asked that Mr. Kochan take the future discussions into hand.

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

**THAT the Board of Governors approves:**

**A) Residence room rates for 2014-15 of:**

Pembina Hall Residence	\$6,290
Arthur Mauro Residence	\$6,630
University College Residence and Mary Speechly Hall Residence	
• Single Room	\$4,624
• Double Room	\$2,954

**B) Meal plan rates for 2014-15 of:**

10 Meals per Week plus \$500 FoodBucks -	\$4,550
15 Meals per Week plus \$500 FoodBucks -	\$4,900
7-Day Unlimited plus \$125 FoodBucks -	\$5,050

Super Saver Membership -	\$2,200 FoodBucks
Bison Membership -	\$2,400 FoodBucks
Premium Membership -	\$2,800 FoodBucks

**C) And the introduction of:**

An extended stay/meal fee of \$350 for students staying over the University holiday closure period.

**CARRIED**

**7.3 Bannatyne Campus Master Plan**

Ms. Bovey stated that some Board members had the opportunity in 2012 to tour the Bannatyne campus with the architect of the Master Plan, George Cibinel, which was very valuable and it is exciting to see the plan come to the Board of Governors.

Mr. Kochan reported that this plan has been approved by Senate after being reviewed by Senate Committees. He added that approximately 800 people were consulted throughout the development process. Mr. Konowalchuk introduced George Cibinel, the Architect of the plan, who was present to answer questions. Mr. Konowalchuk stated that this plan had been two years in the making and was the result of the work of the Campus Planning Office, George Cibinel and Cibinel Architects, and Education Consulting Services, the consultant on the project.

Mr. Konowalchuk commented that this is a high-level document, providing a framework for a broad vision for the next 25 years, noting that because this is a living document it must change and adapt based on opportunities and realities. The intent is for it to provide clear direction while remaining mindful of the need for flexibility so the document can be revised and will evolve over the years. Mr. Konowalchuk explained that the development of the plan was driven by a number of factors, including the need to relocate the Nursing building to the Bannatyne campus, an increased need for interprofessional education, a lack of campus amenities, and the need for a better sense of campus identity and a stronger relationship with the surrounding community.

He provided a list of over 30 stakeholders who were consulted during the planning and engagement process. Mr. Konowalchuk explained that the local community and surrounding neighbourhoods were engaged in discussion and provided a summary of major themes that arose from those conversations. The themes he listed included Services and Amenities, Transportation, Sustainability, Building and Space Issues, Interprofessional Education, Safety and Security, and the Relationship with the Surrounding Community.

Mr. Konowalchuk commented that drafting the plan was a two year process and the final open house will take place in April of 2014. He reported that some key changes had been made in response to stakeholder feedback, administrative guidance and input, and the steering committee input. The changes include: (1) the relocation of the nursing building to bring it closer to the heart of campus and to open up as yet undefined opportunities for some type of outreach use in the building along Tecumseh Avenue, (2) the elimination of the Student Residence Tower



due to complications with locating it on top of an academic building and to neighbourhood concerns about the location and (3) the reconfiguration of the development on 'E' lot to allow for expanded dentistry facilities, relocated medical programs, decanting space, a possible interprofessional clinic, and possible student life amenities.

Mr. Konowalchuk noted some new opportunities since previous draft related to student housing as there is a significant demand for residential units and limited space on campus available. He explained that there may be some partnership opportunities with surrounding neighbourhoods to address demand for student housing, daycare spaces, and parking.

Referring to page 28 and 29, Mr. Konowalchuk highlighted the way in which people will circulate throughout the campus, which will incorporate the use of overhead walkways, weather protected walkways as well as traffic slowing measures on McDermot Avenue. Dr. Barnard asked how future development of the Health Sciences Centre will interconnect with this plan. Mr. Konowalchuk responded that it was necessary for some step down in scale to stay with the feeling of areas adjacent to the campus, noting that they would use taller buildings at the middle of campus and lower building heights at the periphery to match the neighbouring residential areas.

Mr. Robertson commented that this was an exciting plan, and was well-principled and responsible. Mr. Zegalski asked why the plan is confined to just the existing area and whether more land might be acquired in the area. Mr. Konowalchuk explained that the streets that bound the campus are zoned E1 and the rest are residential, adding that there is an existing agreement that there will be no institutional expansion into the neighbourhood and the University must be sensitive to that. He added that there was some concern raised in the community open houses related to expanding the footprint. Finally, he noted that there is a school on Elgin and a Public Works Yard north of campus that might present opportunities for expansion in the future.

Dr. Barnard reminded the Board that there is no timeline included in this document, as so much of the development will depend on government funding. He explained that the plan represents a vision of where the campus can go, not a dated plan for next steps. It is a long term vision which required managing expectations against the rate of development. He added that the priorities will be relocating Nursing to that campus and vacating T building but that this will be contingent on what kind of funding opportunities are available. Regarding funding priorities, Mr. Kochan stated that the Taché project is the next priority, followed by the Nursing relocation.

Mr. Cibinel informed the Board that the plan's intent was to be careful not to go outside the University's boundaries, noting that this is just the first part of a 100 year plan. The focus is to develop first on the easy places to develop and that expansion is toward the Brodie Centre Building. He added in the 100 year plan, older buildings will go off line and be replaced with taller buildings and that the removal of the T building will provide some green space.



In response to a question from Ms. Labine about traffic problems, Mr. Cibinel commented that transportation is critical as there are already concerns about safety related to the traffic flow and volume. He added that there will be a parking plan done in conjunction with HSC to provide more parking spaces and public transport will be promoted. Additionally, he explained that for pedestrian safety traffic calming strategies will be put in place on McDermot Avenue and two pedestrian bridges have been proposed for crossing the street. Mr. Cibinel commented that it would be important to find a balance between implementing these strategies and preserving the vitality at street level.

Regarding the concern about child care, Mr. Cibinel noted that there is an identified need for 100 places which would require a significant amount of indoor and outdoor space and would generate a large amount of traffic for drop off and pick up; therefore, he believes day care belongs off campus. He added that there is no answer to the child care question as yet and off-site opportunities are being sought.

Mr. Robertson remarked that this document is a high level plan with guiding principles, and noted that programs and plans change over years so only a certain level of detail expected in master plans. He explained that there will be more details provided as steps are implemented.

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

**THAT the Board of Governors approve, in principle, the Bannatyne Campus Master Plan [November 7, 2013], as recommended by Senate on February 5, 2014.**

**CARRIED**

The Chair thanked Mr. Cibinel and his team their work as well as Mr. Konowalchuk and the Campus Planning Office.

## **FOR INFORMATION**

### **8. UPDATES**

#### **8.1 Update from the UMSU President**

Mr. Turnbull reported that elections had just been completed so he had been on a leave of absence to campaign. He asked Ms. Ally to report on any matters that may have come up during that period. Ms. Ally stated that UMSU was involved in consultations related to the Strategic Planning Framework and that budget consultations would soon begin. She added that the term of the current UMSU Executive end April 30, so they will be in a transition process for the next while.


#### **8.2 Update from the GSA President**


Ms. Wetzel's written report was included in the meeting materials. There were no questions.

**MOTION TO MOVE TO CLOSED AND CONFIDENTIAL SESSION**

It was moved by Dr. Embree and seconded by Ms. Wetzel:  
**THAT the meeting move into Closed and Confidential Session.**

**CARRIED**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
University Secretary

