

Minutes of a meeting of a Meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. Remotely via Zoom Video Conference

Members Present

Dr. D. Barnard, Chair
 Dr. C. Adams
 Prof. B. Albensi
 Prof. A. Alessi-Severini
 Prof. C. Anderson
 Prof. J. Anderson
 Mr. J. Asaminew
 Prof. B. Austin-Smith
 Mr. A. Azeez
 Dean S. Baum
 Dean J. Beddoes
 Ms. L. Best
 Prof. R. Biscontri
 Dr. J. Blatz
 Prof. P. Blunden
 Prof. T. Bone
 Prof. N. Boorberg
 Prof. O. Botar
 Rectrice S. Bouffard
 Dean D. Brown
 Prof. F. Burczynski
 Ms. R. Calotes
 Prof. T. Chen
 Prof. N. Cicek
 Prof. G. Clark
 Prof. S. Clark
 Mr. M. Colley
 Dr. C. Cook
 Mr. G. Cruise
 Prof. R. Currie
 Prof. M. Czubryt
 Ms. J. Dela Cruz
 Prof. S. Dhingra
 Ms. C. Dika
 Prof. M. Domaratzki
 Mr. Wm. Dowie
 Dean N. Dyck
 Mr. D. Erickson
 Prof. J. Frank
 Prof. M. Gabbert
 Prof. M. Garcia-Holguera
 Mr. M. Garrett
 Mr. T. Gibbes

Ms. A. Ginter
 Dean N. Halden
 Prof. E. Haque
 Prof. J. Hare
 Prof. G. Hicks
 Prof. J. Honeyford
 Prof. D. Ireland
 Prof. T. Ivanco
 Dean G. Jacoby
 Dr. D. Jayas
 Ms. L. Johnson
 Dean E. Jurkowski
 Ms. E. Kalo
 Mr. J. Kearsey
 Prof. R. Koop
 Ms. N. Lam
 Prof. L. Landrum
 Ms. M.-L. Lê
 Prof. K. MacKendrick
 Prof. S. McClement
 Chancellor A. Mahon
 Prof. K. Main
 Dean D. Mandzuk
 Prof. B. Mark
 Prof. C. Miller
 Ms. M. Nguy
 Prof. K. Nixon
 Ms. L. O'Hara
 Prof. D. Oliver
 Prof. S. Olson
 Prof. J. Paliwal
 Prof. S. Passmore
 Prof. J. Peeler
 Mr. B. Petrelli
 Ms. S. Phillips
 Mr. E. Podaima
 Dean B. Postl
 Mr. G. Prairie
 Prof. S. Prentice
 Dean L. Raman-Wilms
 Prof. M. Rastegar
 Prof. T. Reeve
 Prof. B. Rice
 Dr. J. Ristock
 Ms. J. Ritchie
 Ms. H. Ritter

Ms. G. Romund
 Dean. M. Scanlon
 Prof. C. Schmidt
 Ms. L. Schnarr
 Prof. A. Schultz
 Mr. M. Shaw
 Acting Dean L. Simard
 Ms. L. Slegers
 Ms. H. Smeltzer
 Prof. M. Smith
 Mr. G. Sobie
 Prof. J. Sorensen
 Prof. R. Souleymanov
 Mr. R. Talukder
 Prof. M. Tamtik
 Ms. J. Tanner
 Dean J. Taylor
 Ms. E. Thomas
 Prof. G. Thompson
 Prof. G. Tranmer
 Prof. C. Trott
 Dean R. Urbanowski
 Prof. J. van Lierop
 Mr. C. Villa
 Prof. D. Walker
 Dean M. Yellow Bird
 Ms. L. Zapshala-Kelln
 Mr. J. Leclerc,
 University Secretary
 Dr. S. Coyston,
 Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. J. Adams
 Dr. D. Hiebert-Murphy
 Prof. R. Lastra
 Mr. N. Marnoch
 Dr. T. Mondor
 Prof. G. Smith
 Ms. K. Smith
 Dr. D. Stewart
 Dr. M. Torchia
 Ms. B. Usick
 Prof. D. Watt

Regrets

Dr. J. Doering
 Dr. G. Glavin
 Mr. A. Morakis

Absent

Dean J. Black-Branch
 Very Rev. R. Bozyk
 Ms. S. Cameron
 Prof. D. Gardner
 Dean A. Kelekis-Cholakis
 Prof. W. Kinsner
 Mr. A. Morakis
 Prof. A. Raouf
 Prof. A. Schwann
 Ms. S. Sekander
 Mr. E. Teklemariam
 Ms. S. Tombindo

Also Present

Dr. M. Benarroch
 Prof. B. Curran
 Prof. M. Edwards
 Ms. S. Foster
 Ms. P. Gareau
 Ms. S. Harden
 Ms. J. Hepburn
 Ms. A. Khan
 Ms. K. McQuarrie-Smith
 Ms. H. Morris
 Ms. P. Trupish
 Ms. S. Utsunomiya
 Ms. M. Watson
 Ms. M. Yoshida

President Barnard welcomed Senators back to the first full Senate meeting since the beginning of the pandemic. He thanked Mr. Leclerc and staff in the Office of the University Secretary for arranging for Senate to meet remotely via video conference.

President Barnard said almost two months had passed since the closure of university buildings and the sudden shift to remote delivery of all classes. He expressed his profound gratitude to Senators and faculty members across the University for their tremendous dedication in the myriad efforts that had been made to support students and to ensure the critical work of the University continued despite the COVID-19 pandemic. The hard work had been fundamental to bringing the Winter Term to a successful conclusion despite extraordinary challenges. President Barnard said he and the Executive Team recognized faculty were now working to prepare for the Summer Term, which would be delivered entirely via remote means, and also to prepare for the Fall Term. He acknowledged these times were challenging not only for students but for faculty members and their families.

President Barnard thanked members of the University community for the way in which they had responded, to the need to do things in a way that had never been attempted before, with professionalism, commitment and innovation. He was confident that he spoke for students, their families, and the entire community, when expressing his gratitude and pride in the University community.

President Barnard remarked that, amidst the uncertainty created by new modes of working and delivering academic programs, there had been additional uncertainty about the directive from the provincial government to identify measures to reduce the University's operating grant. He reported that, in discussions with provincial officials through this period, he and other University representatives had reinforced that:

- the University community was eager to help with the COVID-19 relief effort. Students and staff had volunteered in screening activities, with procurement of personal protective equipment (PPE), were undertaking important research initiatives, and the University's many academic healthcare programs would provide the future professionals who would work directly to combat the impact of COVID-19.
- the University was not closed now and would not be closing. The Winter Term had been completed and the University was in the midst of extensive work to offer both the Summer and Fall Terms.
- the move to remote learning had never been done before in this complete way, and it was involving a significant amount of work by academic and support staff alike.
- the work of the University was meaningful and important, especially when considering the centrality of its role to Manitoba's economic and social well-being.

President Barnard said, throughout this challenging and uncertain time, he had committed to provide as much information as possible as soon as possible. He recognized and respected that the lack of clarity the University had been dealing with as a community contributed to angst and anxiety during what was already a very difficult time in the world. At the end of the previous week, he and Mr. Kearsey, Vice-President (External), had met with Minister Eichler and Deputy Minister Forster, regarding the provincial grant reduction exercise. Though the University continued to wait for written confirmation on provincial cuts to the operating grant, President

Barnard shared what the University had been told by the Minister of Economic Development and Training, Mr. Eichler. Specifically, that the provincial government would reduce the University's 2020 - 2021 operating grant by 5 percent (\$17.3 million), including an ongoing reduction of 1 percent and a 4 percent reduction, which the University had been assured would be only for this year. The University had already made some difficult decisions, as it responded to work disruptions, revenue losses, and increased costs resulting from the global pandemic. The University community would need to continue to work together to address additional pressures put on the University's budget as a result of this significant cut. The President's Executive Team was developing several budget scenarios to address this new reality and was committed to moving forward with a thoughtful, measured approach. Some of the tools that were being considered were reductions to discretionary spending, hiring deferrals, voluntary workweek reductions, and layoffs.

President Barnard said he continued to emphasise to government and to the community that the University of Manitoba had always been and would continue to be central to Manitoba's economic and social success. Postsecondary education would be crucial to the post-COVID-19 recovery, and critical work carried out by the University would continue as demand for postsecondary education increased during these uncertain times. Faculty and staff continued to do exceptional work in the midst of the pandemic and the challenging budget constraints. Now was a time for members of the University community to remain focussed on their shared mission and vision for the institution; to support ground-breaking research, student success and impactful community engagement. The critical work of the University continued despite disruption, and it would be necessary to continue to collaborate and adjust if the institution was to succeed in the face of these challenges.

President Barnard said he remained committed to share accurate and timely information with members of the University community moving forward. He thanked Senators and members of the University community for their ongoing commitment and resilience.

President Barnard invited Dr. Ristock, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), to provide an update on academic planning.

Dr. Ristock thanked faculty, staff, and Deans, for their outstanding work to ensure students could complete their courses and be successful. She had been impressed and inspired by people's creativity and commitment.

Dr. Ristock said Senate Executive had been meeting weekly to respond to various academic issues related to the impact of COVID-19. In addition, she had been meeting weekly with Deans. An Academic Advisory Sub-committee chaired by Dr. Mondor, Deputy Provost (Academic Programs and Planning), had worked diligently to consider the changes before consulting with Deans and bringing proposals forward to Senate Executive for consideration. Dr. Ristock thanked members of the Sub-committee for their ongoing work. She said conversations at Senate Executive concerning the various proposals had been collegial, robust, and careful, and student success and the delivery of academic programs had been at the heart of all of the committee's deliberations.

Dr. Ristock identified several key decisions that had been made to facilitate the successful completion of the Winter Term, including: options for fair grading for students; a four-month extension to the maximum time allowed for completion of graduate degree requirements; a revised Academic Schedule for the 2020 Summer Term, with an earlier period for Distance Education courses and a later period for other remote learning options. Dr. Ristock reported that

enrolment in Distance Education courses had increased significantly over the previous Summer Term, and there were indications that, although there would be fewer courses offered, the total number of seats available for the 2020 Summer Term courses would be higher than the previous year. Registration for the Summer Term would begin on May 19.

Dr. Ristock recalled that in-person classes had not been held since mid-March, and there was no indication it would be safe to resume in-person instruction by September. She announced the University's decision to deliver most courses by remote learning for the 2020 Fall Term. The decision would be distributed that day through UM Today, Week at a Glance, so students would be aware of the decision as they began to register for Fall Term courses. Dr. Ristock said many universities had recently made similar announcements. The health and safety of students, faculty members, and staff were primary considerations in the University's decision, as well as a desire to deliver high quality programs, primarily remotely. The decision was being announced now, to allow both local and international students to plan to complete courses without having to be physically present at the University from September to December 2020. Also, delaying the decision would have placed an unfair burden on faculty, as it would require them to prepare for two possible scenarios, to teach in-person and by remote learning. Dr. Ristock recognized that some courses could not be completed remotely. In exceptional circumstances, the University would identify protocols that would need to be in place to accommodate and safely deliver as many of these courses as possible. Any decisions made with respect to in-person, on-campus course delivery would be guided by public health recommendations and provincial directives. Students would be provided with information on the mode of course delivery when registering for courses in Aurora, so they could make informed course selections. The Academic Schedule for the 2020 Fall Term and the 20201 Winter Term was recently revised (Senate Executive, May 6, 2020) to include an optional ten-day period, from January 5 – 15, 2021, to schedule critical in-person instruction and experiences for Fall Term courses.

Dr. Ristock said other COVID-19 related adjustments made by the University included the cancellation of in-person convocation ceremonies and extending the maximum untenured period for all faculty members in probationary appointments. The University Libraries were working with instructors to identify digital textbooks and course material options for the Summer and Fall Terms. With respect to convocation, Dr. Ristock said the University would deliver parchments to graduands and would host five virtual convocation sessions for graduating students, on June 29. The convocation sessions would be live-streamed, student-centred, and would also be available on demand for those who were not able to participate live.

Dr. Ristock observed that the previous eight weeks had been both unprecedented and challenging and the University still faced uncertainties with respect to COVID-19, including the potential for a second and third wave of the virus. She said she would continue to communicate key decisions to Deans, to share with faculty members, and to post communiques on the University's COVID-19 website. Dr. Ristock thanked Senators and expressed her gratitude for the impressive work and the adjustments made by many at the University, including faculty members, staff, and students.

President Barnard welcomed Senators to the meeting. He welcomed President-Designate Michael Benarroch, who, as part of the transition to a new president, would join meetings of Senate and the Board of Governors, as an observer, between now and the end of June.

Dr. Benarroch said it was a pleasure to be back at the University of Manitoba, if only virtually. It was not how he had imagined he would be reintroduced to the University community, at the time that he had accepted the position of President. Dr. Benarroch said he, too, wanted to

acknowledge the work that had been done at the University, in what were unprecedented times, as reflected President Barnard's and Dr. Ristock's previous comments. It was a difficult time for the University, and yet the institution had continued to serve its students, and people had continued to carry out their jobs within the institution. Dr. Benarroch said it was a credit to universities across the world, which had continued to provide services that had traditionally been provided, to put students first and ensure they could continue to progress through their education. He observed, with respect to Dr. Ristock's announcement that most courses would be delivered by remote learning for the 2020 Fall Term, that the same decision had been taken by universities across Canada, given safety was a foremost concern for institutions. Dr. Benarroch said he was confident that, as people continued to work together, the University would emerge as a stronger institution.

The Chair informed Senate that the Speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Robert Biscontri, Asper School of Business.

The Chair thanked faculty representatives to Senate whose terms would end on May 31st, for their service on Senate.

I ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVES

1. To the Board of Governors

Page 8

The Chair said one Senator was to be elected by Senate to the Board of Governors for a three-year term, to replace Dean Taylor, whose term would expire on May 31, 2020. Current Senate representatives on the Board were Dean Taylor (Faculty of Arts), Professor John Anderson (Faculty of Science), and Professor Prentice (Faculty of Arts). Dean Taylor was eligible for re-election.

The University Secretary opened nominations.

On motions duly moved and seconded, Dean Taylor and Dean Baum (Faculty of Science) were nominated.

On a motion duly moved and seconded, nominations were closed.

Dean Taylor was **ELECTED** to the Board of Governors for a three-year term ending on May 31, 2023.

2. To the Senate Executive Committee

Page 9

The Chair said two Senators were to be elected from among members of Senate elected by faculty and school councils, each for a three-year term, to replace Professor Chen (Faculty of Arts) and Professor Gabbert (Faculty of Arts). Both Professor Chen and Professor Gabbert were eligible for re-election.

The University Secretary opened nominations.

On motions duly moved and seconded, Professor Chen and Professor Gabbert were nominated.

On a motion duly moved and seconded, nominations were closed.

Professor Chen and Professor Gabbert were declared **ELECTED** to the Senate Executive Committee, for three-year terms ending on May 31, 2023.

The Chair said one Senator was to be elected from amongst the Vice-Presidents, Deans of Faculties and Directors of Schools, for a three-year term, to replace Dean Jurkowski (Desautels Faculty of Music), whose term would expire on May 31st. Dean Jurkowski was eligible for re-election.

The University Secretary opened nominations.

On a motion duly moved and seconded, Dean Jurkowski was nominated.

On a motion duly moved and seconded, nominations were closed.

Dean Jurkowski was declared **ELECTED** to the Senate Executive Committee for a three-year term ending on May 31, 2023.

3. Election of a Student Member to the Senate Executive Committee Page 11

The Chair reminded Senators that the composition of the Senate Executive Committee provides for one voting member and one assessor member, to be chosen by and from the student Senators.

Ms. Dela Cruz MOVED, on behalf of the Student Senate Caucus, nominating Mr. Evan Podaima to serve as the voting member on the Senate Executive Committee.

CARRIED

Ms. Dela Cruz said the Student Senate Caucus had appointed Mr. William Dowie (Graduate Studies) to serve as the Student Assessor.

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes Page 12

The Chair said, in keeping with past practice, minor corrections to the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes should be reported to the Office of the University Secretary.

2. Report of the Faculty Council of the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources RE: Revised Science and Faculty of Arts Course Requirements Page 184

a) Report of Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation Page 184

b) Report of Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes Page 185

2. **Reports of the Faculty of Graduate Studies Executive Committee on Course and Curriculum Changes**
 - a) **RE: Modification of GRAD 7300, Faculty of Graduate Studies** Page 187
 - b) **RE: Department of Occupational Therapy** Page 189
3. **Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes RE: BFAR Statements, College of Dentistry, Department of Psychology, and Faculty of Social Work** Page 190
4. **Reports of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Course, Curriculum and Regulation Changes**
 - a) **RE: Department of Biosystems Engineering** Page 213
 - b) **RE: Department of Classics** Page 219
 - c) **RE: Department of French, Spanish and Italian** Page 229
 - d) **RE: Department of Interior Design** Page 232
 - e) **RE: Department of Landscape Architecture** Page 235
 - f) **RE: College of Pharmacy** Page 240
 - g) **RE: Department of Physiology and Pathophysiology** Page 246
 - h) **RE: College of Rehabilitation Sciences** Page 273
 - i) **RE: Department of Sociology and Criminology** Page 276
 - j) **RE: Université de Saint-Boniface (M.A. in Canadian Studies)** Page 280

Professor Biscontri MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve the:

- **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes;**
- **Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation and the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes concerning revised Science and Faculty of Arts Course Requirements for undergraduate programs in the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources, effective September 1, 2020;**
- **Reports of the Faculty of Graduate Studies Executive Committee on Course and Curriculum Changes, effective for the next available term:**

- RE: Modification of GRAD 7300, Faculty of Graduate Studies
- RE: Department of Occupational Therapy
- Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes concerning BFAR Statements for the College of Dentistry, Department of Psychology, and Faculty of Social Work, effective for the next available term;
- Reports of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Course, Curriculum and Regulation Changes, effective for the next available term:
 - RE: Department of Biosystems Engineering
 - RE: Department of Classics
 - RE: Department of French, Spanish, and Italian
 - RE: Department of Interior Design
 - RE: Department of Landscape Architecture
 - RE: College of Pharmacy
 - RE: Department of Physiology and Pathophysiology
 - RE: College of Rehabilitation Sciences
 - RE: Department of Sociology and Criminology
 - RE: Université de Saint-Boniface (M.A. in Canadian Studies)

CARRIED

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1.	<u>2020-2021 List of Senate Members</u>	Page 310
2.	<u>Schedule of Meetings and Agenda Availability for Senate and Senate Executive Committee</u>	Page 315
3.	<u>Annual Reports of Standing Committees of Senate</u>	
a)	<u>Academic Accommodation Appeals</u>	Page 316
b)	<u>Academic Computing</u>	Page 317
c)	<u>Academic Dress</u>	Page 319
d)	<u>Academic Freedom</u>	Page 320
e)	<u>Academic Review</u>	Page 321
f)	<u>Admission Appeals</u>	Page 323
g)	<u>Admissions</u>	Page 324
h)	<u>Appeals</u>	Page 328
i)	<u>Approved Teaching Centres</u>	Page 330
j)	<u>Awards</u>	Page 331

k)	<u>Calendar</u>	Page 333
l)	<u>Curriculum and Course Changes</u>	Page 334
m)	<u>Honorary Degrees</u>	Page 336
n)	<u>Instruction and Evaluation</u>	Page 337
o)	<u>Joint Master's Programs</u>	Page 339
p)	<u>Joint Master's Programs Appeals</u>	Page 341
q)	<u>Libraries</u>	Page 342
r)	<u>Medical Qualifications</u>	Page 343
s)	<u>Nominations</u>	Page 344
t)	<u>Planning and Priorities</u>	Page 345
u)	<u>Rules and Procedures</u>	Page 347
v)	<u>University Research</u>	Page 348

Standing committees of Senate are required to report at least once a year unless otherwise specified in the terms of reference. The Chair referred Senators to the annual reports for Standing Committees of Senate for 2019 -2020 that were circulated with the agenda.

President Barnard thanked members of Senate Committees for their work and their contributions throughout the year.

4. Reports of the Senate Committee on Awards

a)	<u>February 20, 2020</u>	Page 350
b)	<u>April 7, 2020</u>	Page 361

5. Report of the Senate Committee on Appeals [April 8, 2020] Page 371

6. Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes RE: Annual Update on Academic Program Listing Page 373

7. Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Revised Definitions in Policies and Procedures for the Undergraduate Medical Education Program, Max Rady College of Medicine

a)	<u>National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME) Exam</u>	Page 376
----	--	----------

Dr. Torchia said that, subsequent to the February 13, 2020 meeting of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation (SCIE), given circumstances that had arisen as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic that required a pause in the Undergraduate Medical Education (UGME) Program curriculum, the Max Rady College of Medicine was proposing a further revision to the definition for the National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME) Exam. Specifically, that the final two sentences of the definition would read:

For students who write their NBME exam prior to May 19, 2020, attaining a mark at the 11th percentile or higher is considered a pass. For students who write their NBME exams on May 19, 2020 and thereafter, the NBME will recommend a pass mark as an equated percent correct score, and the UGME Program will determine the pass mark every September, based on this recommendation.

The additional revision would prevent a situation where multiple UGME Program cohorts would concurrently write the NBME exam with different standards for a pass. The revised definition had been endorsed by the UGME Progress Committee and the College Executive Council of the Max Rady College of Medicine.

- b) **Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE-type) and Comprehensive Clinical Exam (CCE)** Page 380
- 8. **Student Advocacy Annual Report, 2018 - 2019** Page 384
- 9. **Request to Revise Admission Target RE: Bachelor of Commerce (Honours), I.H. Asper School of Business** Page 397
(for consultation)

The Chair said that, under the *Admission Targets* policy, it is the President who approves changes to, or the introduction of, enrolment limits following consultation with the dean or director and with Senate and the Board of Governors, subject to the provisions of the provincial Programs of Study Regulation. He asked if there were any questions or comments concerning a request to increase the admission target for the Bachelor of Commerce (Honours) program, in the Asper School of Business, as outlined in the request.

Senate did not raise any concerns regarding the request.

- 10. **Correspondence from President and Vice-Chancellor**
 - a) **RE: Increase to Admission Target, Bachelor of Kinesiology, President's Approval** Page 463
 - b) **RE: Extension of Suspension of Admissions, Bachelor of Human Ecology in Family Social Sciences and Bachelor of Human Ecology in Family Social, After Degree Programs, President's Approval** Page 464
 - c) **RE: Temporary Increase and Reallocation, Bachelor of Social Work, Faculty of Social Work, President's Approval** Page 465
- 11. **Correspondence from Provost and Vice-President (Academic) RE: Implementation of Bachelor of Midwifery Program** Page 466

12. **Item Approved by the Board of Governors Executive Committee [February 25, 2019]** Page 469

13. **Items Approved by the Board of Governors [March 24, 2020]** Page 470

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

1. **April 1, 2020** Page 471

2. **May 13, 2020** Page 479

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. on the Friday preceding the meeting.

The following proposals were received from Faculty of Arts Senators:

We are deeply committed to the value of bicameral governance. In that spirit, we wish to raise the following points on behalf of Senators in the Faculty of Arts:

First, we would like to ask for extra meetings of Senate this summer. Under the current schedule, the June meeting inaugurates a period of no Senate meetings until October. We would like to ask for a meeting in July with the new President in his capacity as newly installed Chair of Senate in order to hear and discuss both his vision and the pragmatics of making academic decisions for the fall and beyond. We also propose a meeting in August, and possibly September as well.

Second, we propose reverting to normal Senate decision-making processes next month. In consequence, we propose undoing the extraordinary temporary arrangement that delegated authority to Senate Executive. We are providing notice that a motion to this effect will be submitted for the June 24th meeting.

Third, during the remaining weeks in which Senate Executive enjoys extraordinary powers, we ask for maximum transparency and the circulation of all Executive agendas and minutes. Associated with this, we request that all members of Senate receive information (including membership list) about the Pandemic Planning Committee and its sub-committees, including the Academic Committee.

President Barnard said he and his Executive Team were also committed to the value of collegial governance and appreciated the work completed across the University during the previous two months. With respect to the possibility of holding Senate meetings over the summer, he said he would discuss the idea with the Senate Executive Committee, given its role in setting the Senate agendas, and would consult with Dr. Benarroch, the incoming Chair of Senate, about the timing of any additional meetings.

President Barnard said he agreed that ending the delegated approval authority to Senate Executive was a priority. He said that, under the motion approved by Senate on March 16, 2020, which specified that "normal approval channels shall be restored by the

President as soon as it is permissible and safe to do so," he would restore the normal approval channel to Senate, effective after the June 24, 2020 Senate meeting. Any matters requiring urgent resolution after that date could be dealt with via a regular or Special Meeting of Senate held via electronic means. President Barnard suggested that, on this basis, a notice of motion would not be required.

Regarding the request for transparency, President Barnard said he would invite the University Secretary to speak to the process that would be put in place to share matters considered by Senate Executive on behalf of Senate. The matter had been raised at Senate Executive the previous week, and the process had been communicated to members of Senate Executive on Monday. President Barnard committed to having the response and recovery committee membership lists shared with Senate.

President Barnard said he appreciated the efforts of all those involved in the University's collective work since the Special Meeting of Senate on March 16th. The University had come through a very important and challenging time and had been able to make important decisions safely and promptly. President Barnard said he looked forward to reverting back to a normal order for Senate, albeit while meeting remotely.

Mr. Leclerc said, in response to a request at Senate Executive the previous week, the Office of the University Secretary had communicated to the Committee that it would make the agendas and approved minutes of Senate Executive meetings to deal with COVID-19 matters available on the University Governance webpage. Moving forward, the agendas would be posted when they were made available to Senate Executive, and a notice would be emailed to Senators to advise them of the posting. This would facilitate Senators sharing any feedback they might have with the University Secretary, to communicate to Senate Executive.

VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

1. March 4, 2020

Dean Jurkowski MOVED, seconded by Professor Chen, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on March 4, 2020 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Special Meeting on March 16, 2020

Professor Botar MOVED, seconded by Dean Jurkowski, THAT the minutes of the Special Meeting of Senate meeting held on March 16, 2020 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. Reports of the Senate Executive Committee

- a) **March 18, 2020** Page 486
- b) **April 29, 2020** Page 487
- c) **Approvals by Senate Executive on behalf of Senate during the Emergency Period (March 18 – April 29, 2020)** Page 491

Professor Biscontri said the Senate Executive committee held its regular monthly meetings on March 18 and April 29, 2020. The comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they were made.

Professor Biscontri recalled that, at a Special Meeting of Senate on March 16, 2020, Senate had delegated its approval authority to the Senate Executive Committee for academic matters arising during the emergency period arising from the COVID-19 pandemic. At both the March 18 and April 19 meetings, and at several Special Meetings of Senate Executive, the committee had approved, on behalf of Senate, those items outlined in agenda item VIII (1) (c) Approvals by Senate Executive on behalf of Senate during the Emergency Period (March 18 – April 29, 2020).

Professor Biscontri said Senate Executive had recommended nominees to fill several vacancies on the Senate Committee on Nominations, for academic staff.

Professor Biscontri MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT the following nominations to the Senate Committee on Nominations, for three-year terms beginning in June 1, 2020 and ending May 31, 2023, be approved by Senate:

- a) **Professor Pam Perkins (re-appointment) representing Arts;**
- b) **Dean Reg Urbanowski (re-appointment, Senator) representing Health Sciences;**
- c) **Professor Robert Biscontri (re-appointment, Senator) representing Management, Law, and Social Work.**

CARRIED

2. Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

Professor Watt said the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC) had met on March 30, 2020, to discuss a proposal from the Department of Chemistry for major curriculum revisions and to approve two Reports from the committee to Senate. The SPPC had also participated in an electronic poll conducted between April 15 and 20, to approve the committee's Report to Senate on course and curriculum changes proposed by the Department of Chemistry, which was provided as item IX (2)(a) on the Senate agenda.

Professor Watt thanked members of the SPPC and the Recording Secretary, for their work on the committee.

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

**1. Reports of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on
Course, Curriculum and Regulation Changes**

**a) RE: Proposal for a Master of Supply Chain Management Page 496
and Logistics, Asper School of Business**

Acting Dean Simard said the Asper School of Business was proposing to establish a Master of Supply Chain Management and Logistics. The proposal had undergone a lengthy review process within the Faculty of Graduate Studies, including a site visit by an external review committee. The proposal was endorsed by the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies at its meeting on October 23, 2019. The proposed program would be a 24-month, 48 credit hour, course-based degree that students could complete on either a full- or part-time basis. The objective of the program would be to promote a significant practical component that would translate theory into practice and would build leadership skills while addressing real-world challenges encountered by organizations and supply chains in Manitoba, in Canada, and internationally. The program would require fifteen 3 credit hour courses, to be completed over five academic terms, and one 3 credit hour practicum or co-operative education experience that would provide hands-on experience.

Acting Dean Simard said the program would require the introduction of seven 3 credit hour courses. The proposal included the report of external reviewers, who had provided strong support for the proposed program and had noted its alignment with the mission and expertise of the Asper School. The program would also align with local and global demand for experts and leaders in supply chain management and logistics.

**i) Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Page 499
Committee**

Professor Watt said the SPPC had deliberated on the proposal for a M.S.C.M. at its meetings on November 25, 2019 and January 27, 2020. The proposal describes an ongoing need for graduates with specialized skills in supply chain management and logistics in the province and nationally. The maximum seat capacity in the program would be fifty (50) students. There would be an initial intake of seven students, which would be increased over time to the maximum enrolment target.

Professor Watt said the Asper School of Business would introduce seven courses, in order to offer the proposed program. It would not require new resources to fund the program, which would be fully funded by tuition and should be self-financing by Year 6, provided enrolment projections described in the proposal were met. The Asper School would cover any costs associated with launching the program.

Professor Watt said the SPPC had recommended that a high priority level be assigned to the proposal, on the basis of the SPPC's criteria for assigning priority to new programs/initiatives.

Acting Dean Simard MOVED, seconded by Professor Biscontri, THAT Senate recommend that the Board of Governors approve a proposal to establish a Master of Supply Chain Management and Logistics, Department of Supply Chain Management, Asper School of Business.

Mr. Dowie asked if tuition for the Master of Supply Chain Management and Logistics would be similar to other professional Master's programs, including the Master of Business Administration, for example, and whether tuition rates for part-time students would be determined based on the number of credit hours in which they were enrolled.

Acting Dean Simard said tuition for the proposed program would be aligned with tuition for other Master's degrees offered by the Asper School of Business. Dean Jacoby said tuition would not be determined by the number of credit hours. Rather, there would be a program fee, which would be the same for both full- and part-time students.

In response to a question, Dean Jacoby said the maximum time for completion, for part-time students, would be six years.

CARRIED

b) RE: Proposal for a Graduate Focus on Aging Concentration, Faculty of Graduate Studies

Page 630

Acting Dean Simard said the Faculty of Graduate Studies was proposing to introduce a Graduate Focus on Aging concentration, which would be available to any graduate student wanting to complete a credential related to aging. Students would be required to: complete 6 credit hours of graduate courses that focus on aging, complete a thesis or practicum on an aging-related topic, have at least one committee member who was a Research Affiliate in the Centre on Aging, present a poster in the Centre's annual Spring Research Symposium at least once.

Acting Dean Simard said the Faculty had previously offered a Graduate Specialization in Aging (2009 - 2018), which was never formally established but had been completed by thirty-three students from several units, which attests to the need for such a program. The proposed concentration aligned with the University's priorities as an age-friendly University and would recognize graduate students' commitment to learning about and acquiring research expertise in aging. The University currently offered the Interfaculty Option in Aging at the undergraduate level, there was no age-based program offered at the graduate level, either at the University of Manitoba or other institutions in the province.

Acting Dean Simard said, as the proposed concentration would be the first faculty-level graduate concentration, it would be necessary to establish relevant program regulations. These would be presented at the June Senate meeting, with other revisions to the *Academic Guide* for 2020-2021.

Acting Dean Simard MOVED, seconded by Professor M. Smith, THAT Senate approve a proposal to establish a Graduate Focus on Aging concentration, in the Faculty of Graduate Studies, effective September 1, 2020.

CARRIED

2. **Report of the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Science** Page 644
RE: Major Curriculum Revisions, Department of Chemistry

- a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum** Page 644
and Course Changes

Professor G. Smith thanked members of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes (SCCCC) and the Recording Secretary for their work on the committee. The committee reviews voluminous materials and had done so both remotely and in-person in recent weeks.

Professor G. Smith said the SCCC had reviewed a proposal from the Faculty of Science, for major revisions to the programs offered by the Department of Chemistry, including the deletion of thirty (30) courses, the introduction of thirty-four (34) courses, the modification of ten (10) courses, which would affect all Bachelor of Science degrees in Chemistry, as well as the Bachelor of Science (Joint Honours) in Chemistry and Physics and Astronomy. The Department was also seeking to close the Chemistry Program Focus Areas (Concentrations) and to replace these with a more streamlined core curriculum. The course and curriculum changes responded to recommendations in an accreditation review in 2015. The revised programs would continue to meet the accreditation requirements of the Canadian Society for Chemistry, including with respect to the number of contact hours in laboratories.

Professor Smith said the Department was proposing to eliminate all 1000- and 2000- level, and most 3000-level courses with embedded laboratories and to introduce stand-alone, for-credit laboratory courses. The objectives of these changes are to offer programs that better integrate practical and deliberative laboratory training; give students credit for academic work completed in the laboratories; and address bottlenecks in existing courses with embedded laboratories, including by giving students who need to repeat either the lecture or the laboratory courses opportunities to complete those courses in additional terms and to complete their programs in a timelier way. Also, the disaggregation of laboratories and lectures would increase flexibility with respect to using the limited number of laboratory spaces that are available.

Professor Smith said the Department of Chemistry had developed transition plans, including course-equivalency tables for use by Academic Advisors, so continuing students could complete the current requirements for their program. The Department had also identified equivalencies for transfer credit, for introductory chemistry courses offered at other universities in the province, to facilitate students transferring into the University.

Professor Smith said the Department of Chemistry had engaged in significant consultations with other units, given the potential impacts of proposed course changes on programs across the University. The SCCCC had requested that the Department consult further with the Faculties of Agricultural and Food Sciences and Environment, Earth, and Resources. Referring to observation 11 of the Report of the SCCCC, Professor Smith said the committee had also asked the Department to consult with the Registrar's Office about the manual administration that might be required to offer two 1.5 credit hour laboratory courses for Engineering programs (CHEM 1122, CHEM 1126) that would be embedded within the regular Fall Term schedule. Given concerns about additional resources that might be required to manage student registrations, for a small number of students, in these two courses, the SCCCC referred the proposal from the Department of Chemistry to the SPPC, to consider the resource implications.

Professor Smith said the SCCCC was recommending that Senate approve the course and curriculum changes proposed by the Department of Chemistry.

b) Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee Page 647

Professor Watt said the SPPC had considered the referral from the SCCCC at its meeting on March 30, 2020, as outlined in observation 3, in the Report of the SPPC. He noted that the Department of Chemistry had consulted with the Registrar's Office concerning the introduction of CHEM 1122 and CHEM 1126. The Registrar had confirmed it would be possible to support these 1.5 credit hour courses within the standard term. Referring Senators to observation 4 in the Report, Professor Watt said the Department of Chemistry was prepared to offer CHEM 1122 and CHEM 1126 for Engineering program because, unlike other units, the Faculty of Engineering would be able to confirm enrolments in the courses prior to the start of term.

Professor Watt said the Department had indicated that it would not require additional resources to offer the revised courses and curricula. Instructors who were currently teaching embedded laboratories would be reassigned to deliver the new laboratory courses.

Professor Watt MOVED, on behalf of the committees, THAT Senate approve the Reports of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes and the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

concerning major curriculum revisions proposed by the Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, effective September 1, 2021.

Professor Currie asked about the status of consultations with the Department of Plant Science, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, concerning the Chemistry course changes. Some students in the Faculty were concerned that, if they would be required to complete only the lecture courses with no laboratory in their programs, the quality of the education they would receive would be reduced but the tuition fees would not. Otherwise, if they would be required to complete both the lecture and the laboratory courses, it would be necessary to reduce the number of free electives, unless the overall number of credit hours required for the degree program was increased.

Professor Smith said he was not aware of the current status of the conversation between the two Departments, but the SCCCC had been assured the conversation was ongoing. The Department of Chemistry had indicated it was willing to tailor the content for some laboratories, to include specific content for programs in the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences. He confirmed that, if units were to amend their programs to require both the lecture and laboratory courses, it would impose an additional 3 credit hours of chemistry courses on students and might require units to reduce the number of elective options in the programs.

Professor Sorensen confirmed that the Department of Chemistry continued to work with the Department of Plant Science, to finalise what the latter unit required for its program.

Professor Shaw asked whether the proposed course changes would require students, including in some Biological Sciences programs, to complete and pay tuition for 3 additional credit hours of Chemistry courses in Year 1 of their programs. He said there did not appear to be increased content and asked for clarification on this point.

Professor Sorensen said the laboratory courses, which were designed to be stand-alone, for-credit courses, would be more comprehensive than the current laboratory sections, which supplemented the lecture sections, and would more accurately reflect the work students were required to complete in the laboratories.

Dean Baum said the proposed course changes respond to input received from Chemistry students who want to receive credit for the significant amount of work currently completed in laboratory sections, for courses with embedded laboratories. The course changes were also intended to address high failure, withdrawal, and repeat rates in first year Chemistry courses, which were attributed, in part, to the high workload for first year Science students, who completed courses with embedded laboratories in various disciplines, including biological sciences, microbiology, and physics. Dean Baum said the Department anticipated that, on average, the course changes would reduce students' tuition costs, as students could complete their first term at University without the extra strain of the

laboratories. This would increase students' success and reduce the number of course repeats. The course changes would also allow the Department to design a better chemistry laboratory and learning experience, with different content than the embedded laboratories.

Professor Walker said some programs offered by the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources required foundational courses in various science disciplines, including chemistry. He raised a concern that, if Senate were to approve the proposal from the Department of Chemistry, it would set a precedent for other departments in the Faculty of Science to also introduce stand-alone laboratory courses. This could lead to some degree programs, including in the Department of Environment and Geography, that would consist primarily of 1000- and 2000- level science lecture and laboratory courses, assuming the programs would continue to be capped at 120 credit hours.

Dean Baum said she was not aware of any other departments in the Faculty of Science that were considering separating lecture and laboratory courses. Chemistry laboratories tended to have more safety concerns, particularly in the first year, and were also costlier than laboratories in other science disciplines, which is why it made sense to separate the laboratories from the lectures. There was already a precedent for separate laboratory courses, which provided intensive laboratory experiences required in the upper years of various Major and Honours programs in Science.

Professor Austin-Smith shared the concern identified by Professor Walker, particularly given the current interest in emphasizing experiential learning, which could be accomplished by the delivery of stand-alone, laboratory-based courses. She remarked that it would be more difficult in future for Senate to articulate why the Department of Chemistry could adopt separate laboratory courses but some other units could not. She asked about the vision for the proposal, beyond recognizing that Chemistry programs were demanding, and whether consideration had been given to the potential ripple effects of the Chemistry proposal.

Dean Baum said the Department of Chemistry had given serious consideration to the question of time to completion. She observed that most students complete more than the 120 credit hours required for their degree programs, including to repeat courses not successfully completed. The Department anticipated, based on modelling it had completed for its programs, that the proposed course and curriculum changes would increase students' success rates in first year courses, in particular, and time to completion. One important component of the proposal was not only to introduce stand-alone laboratory courses but to schedule these in the Winter Term, to follow the corresponding lecture courses that would be scheduled in the Fall Term.

Professor Sorensen said that, when the Department of Chemistry had raised the possibility of not requiring a laboratory in the first year, in its consultations with other units that require chemistry courses in their

programs, most of these units had indicated the laboratory component should be retained, as it provided students with essential skills that were not provided in any other courses. In response to the concern that the proposed course changes might lead to curricula that were predominantly 1000- and 2000- level courses, he noted that programs in particular disciplines, including physics and astronomy, for example, might require only the chemistry lectures and not the laboratories.

Professor Walker observed, and Professor Sorensen confirmed, that first year laboratory courses were required as prerequisites to all 2000- level chemistry courses. So, students would be required to complete 9 credit hours of 1000- level chemistry courses in order to register for 2000- level organic and biochemistry courses, which were the two most popular 2000- level courses offered by the Department.

Dean Jurkowski asked whether the separation of laboratories from lectures might discourage students in other faculties from registering for chemistry courses, given they were limited to 120 credit hours in their programs. Professor Sorenson said the Department anticipated that the reverse might be true, as the current structure of courses with embedded laboratories made it difficult for students in other faculties to fit the courses, with the separate laboratory sections, in their class schedules.

Professor Paliwal said proposed changes to chemistry courses would require that students in the Pre-Veterinary Program, in the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, complete more credit hours, in order to meet the requirements for admission to the Western College of Veterinary Medicine, in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Professor G. Smith noted that it would be up to units that offer programs with chemistry course requirements to determine whether they would require both the lecture and laboratory courses, which might necessitate a reduction in the number of elective credit hours, or only the lecture courses.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

3. **Report of the Université de Saint-Boniface RE: Revised Transfer Pathway, Diplôme en administration des affaires to Baccalauréat en administration des affaires** Page 691

- a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 691

Ms. Schnarr said that, following recent modifications to the Diplôme en administration des affaires offered by the École technique et professionnelle, Université de Saint-Boniface (USB), the credit transfer agreement would be updated to ensure the block transfer was reflective of the changes. Under the current agreement, students who completed the Diploma program with a minimum Grade Point Average of 3.0 were eligible to transfer 54 credits hours of coursework into the Baccalauréat en administration des affaires, at USB. The revised agreement would

allow these students to transfer 57 credit hours from the Diploma to the degree program.

b) Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes

Page 692

Professor G. Smith said the SCCCC had reviewed the proposal from USB to modify the transfer pathway at its meeting on March 24, 2020. Under the revised agreement, graduates of the Diploma program would be eligible to transfer a block transfer of up to 57 credit hours into the Baccalaureate program. Students admitted to the degree program would be required to complete 39 credit hours of required courses, 12 credit hours of optional courses, and 12 credit hours of concentration courses. These students would also be required to complete at least 50 percent of the courses required for the degree at the École d'administration des affaires, USB.

Professor Smith noted that graduates of the Diploma program who had completed the previous curriculum would continue to be considered for admission to the Baccalaureate program based on the requirements for the current transfer arrangement.

Professor G. Smith MOVED, on behalf of the committees, THAT Senate approve the Reports of the Senate Committee on Admissions and the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes concerning a revised transfer pathway from the Diplôme en administration des affaires to the Baccalauréat en administration des affaires, Université de Saint-Boniface, including revised admission and curriculum requirements, effective September 1, 2020.

Mr. Dowie asked whether a mature student seeking admission to the Master of Business Administration would be considered on the basis of having completed courses offered in the Diplôme en administration des affaires and a prior learning assessment. Dean Jacoby said applicants could be admitted without a degree, but a non-degree credential might not be sufficient.

CARRIED

**4. Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review
RE: Revised Academic Program Reviews Policy and Procedure**

Page 705

Dr. Mondor said the Senate Committee on Academic Review was bringing forward a proposal to update the policy and procedure on *Academic Review*, which had not been revised since it was introduced in 2005. The revisions were intended to increase efficiency, consistency, and support for units undergoing a review, and to establish an eight-year review cycle for both undergraduate and graduate reviews, which were currently ten and seven years, respectively, to allow combined reviews for units where this made sense. Dr. Mondor said

revisions to the policy were of a housekeeping nature. Changes to the procedure and to the template for Self-Evaluation Reports, which had been elaborated significantly, would increase efficiency and ensure consistency across reviews. Instructions to review teams had been enhanced, in terms of directions for reviewers and to seek their advice on specific issues.

Dr. Mondor MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review concerning revisions to the *Academic Program Reviews* policy and procedure, effective September 1, 2020.

CARRIED

5. Reports of the Senate Committee on Admissions

- a) **RE: Revised Direct Entry Admission Requirements, Dental Hygiene Diploma, Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry** Page 743

Ms. Schnarr thanked members of the Senate Committee on Admissions (SCADM) for their thoughtful consideration of proposals that had been brought to the committee over the previous year and especially during the previous two months, when the committee had met remotely. She thanked Ms. Stone, Director, Admissions, Ms. Kuznetsova, in her capacity as Recording Secretary for the committee, and staff in Admissions for their support.

Ms. Schnarr said the Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry was proposing to revise the Direct Entry admission requirements for the Diploma in Dental Hygiene, to align these with the Direct Entry admission option framework approved by Senate (May 16, 2018). Applicants would require a minimum 85 percent average over the four academic courses required for admission, with no grade less than 60 percent in any one course.

Ms. Schnarr MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning revised Direct Entry admission requirements for the Diploma in Dental Hygiene, Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry, effective for the Fall 2022 intake.

CARRIED

- b) **RE: Proposal to Create a Casual Student Admission Category, Faculty of Arts** Page 745

Ms. Schnarr said the Faculty of Arts was proposing to establish a Casual Student admission category, to give individuals who were not seeking a degree, an opportunity for admission to the Faculty to complete individual courses for personal interest without having to meet the admission requirements for degree-seeking students. The Faculty found that existing admission categories create unnecessary barriers that prevent individuals, including those who lack high school prerequisite courses and

those who hold advanced degrees but must provide undergraduate transcripts or other documents required for admission, from taking a course for personal interest.

Ms. Schnarr MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal to create a Casual Student Admission Category, Faculty of Arts, effective for the Fall 2021 intake.

Professor Blunden indicated his support for the proposal and encouraged other faculties, including the Faculty of Science, to consider following suit.

Mr. Azeez asked about the credential that students admitted under the Casual Student admission category would graduate with upon completion of a course. Professor G. Smith said the course and the grade received would be noted on students' transcripts. Individuals who might subsequently apply for admission to a degree program could use the course(s) toward the degree. The intent of the proposed admission category was to provide an avenue for individuals to register for university-level courses without barriers to admission.

Professor Chen said the proposal to establish a Casual Student admission category would also respond to the University's priority to increase the diversity of the University community, by removing administrative hurdles associated with obtaining and providing an undergraduate transcript, which can sometimes be onerous for individuals who hold a degree, including elders and others, who have experiences that can contribute to the diversity of the community through their registration and participation in individual courses.

Dean Scanlon asked what the purpose of prerequisite courses was if students admitted under the proposed Casual Student category would not require these, to provide the grounding necessary to succeed in a particular course. While the prerequisites might not be necessary at the introductory level they would, presumably, be necessary at higher levels.

Professor G. Smith said the Casual Student admission category was primarily intended for individuals who wanted to complete 1000- rather than upper-level courses. The proposal was initiated within the Faculty after some individuals had expressed an interest in registering for language courses and Indigenous language courses, in particular, for which no high school level prerequisite courses were available. Mr. Sobie confirmed that students admitted under the proposed category would need to complete any prerequisites required to register in courses beyond the 1000 level.

Professor Lastra asked how the proposed Casual Student admission category would differ from the Special Student admission category. Mr. Sobie replied that, traditionally, the latter category was for applicants who had completed a degree and were seeking admission to either complete additional courses or a second degree.

Mr. Dowie indicated his support for the proposal. He asked if the Casual Student admission category was intended to be a pathway to gain admission to the Bachelor of Integrated Studies offered by the Faculty of Arts. He observed that individuals sometimes require an undergraduate degree in order to receive a particular professional accreditation.

Professor G. Smith replied that the proposed admission category would be a pathway to the B.A.I.S. program, for individuals in the situation described, based on prior learning and university-level courses completed as a Casual Student.

CARRIED

- c) **RE: Revised Admission Requirements, Doctor of Dental Medicine Degree, Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry** Page 750

Ms. Schnarr said the Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry was proposing to modify the admission requirements for the Doctor of Dental Medicine degree, in response to course changes proposed by the Department of Chemistry involving the separation of didactic and laboratory content into separate, 3 credit hours courses. Under the revised admission requirements, applicants from the University of Manitoba would need to complete 69 credit hours in order to be eligible for admission, as opposed to the current requirement for 60 credit hours.

Ms. Schnarr MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning revised admission requirements for the Doctor of Dental Medicine degree, Dr. Gerald Niznick College of Dentistry, effective for the Fall 2022 intake.

CARRIED

- d) **RE: Revised Admission Requirements, Bachelor of Science in Physical Geography, Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources** Page 755

Ms. Schnarr said proposed changes to the admission requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Physical Geography program would provide students with additional flexibility in courses that could be used to meet the requirements. The Department of Mathematics supported the request.

Ms. Schnarr MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Physical Geography, Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources, effective for the Fall 2021 intake.

CARRIED

e) **RE: Revised Admission Requirements, Interdisciplinary Health Program, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences**

i) **Advanced Entry Admission Requirements**

Page 758

Ms. Schnarr said, in order to address the number of students who were struggling in their programs, the Interdisciplinary Health Program (IHP) was proposing to increase the minimum Degree Grade Point Average required for admission to the Bachelor of Health Sciences and Bachelor of Health Studies programs from 2.0 to 2.5, to ensure that students would be adequately prepared for the academic rigours of the programs. The higher standard aligned with the minimum Degree Grade Point Average required for graduation from these programs. Given significant demand for the programs, the IHP was confident that the revised admission requirements would not adversely affect its ability to meet its admission targets.

ii) **Direct Entry Admission Requirements**

Page 760

Ms. Schnarr said the IHP was proposing to modify the Direct Entry admission requirements for the B.H.Sc. and B.H.St. degrees, to align with the Direct Entry framework approved by Senate May 16, 2018. The minimum eligibility for the two programs would be an average of 85 percent over the four academic courses and no less than 60 percent in any one course.

Ms. Schnarr MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Reports of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning revised Advanced Entry and Direct Entry admission requirements for the Interdisciplinary Health Program, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, effective for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 intakes, respectively.

CARRIED

f) **RE: Revised Direct Entry Admission Requirements, Bachelor of Music, Desautels Faculty of Music**

Page 763

Ms. Schnarr said the Desautels Faculty of Music was proposing to modify its Direct Entry admission requirements, to align with the Direct Entry framework. Requirements for an audition, theory test, and letters of recommendation would remain in effect.

Ms. Schnarr MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning revised Direct Entry admission requirements for the Bachelor of Music, Desautels Faculty of Music, effective for the Fall 2022 intake.

CARRIED

g) RE: Revised Admission Requirements, Doctor of Pharmacy Degree, College of Pharmacy

i) Fall 2021 Intake Page 766

ii) Fall 2022 Intake Page 768

Ms. Schnarr said the College of Pharmacy was several changes to the admission requirements for the Doctor of Pharmacy program. Effective for the Fall 2021 intake, the College would allow applicants to complete either STAT 1000 or STAT 1500, to meet the statistics prerequisite. The College had determined that STAT 1500 was a suitable substitute for STAT 1000, based on its consultation with the Department of Statistics, Faculty of Science. Effective for the Fall 2022 intake, the College was proposing to modify the chemistry prerequisites for admission to the program, in response to changes to course offerings in the Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science. The College had reviewed its requirements, to determine which courses, including laboratory courses, would be appropriate and ensure that students would be well prepared to enter the Pharm.D. program. To ensure that applicants would be eligible for admission on the basis of 60 credit hours, the College would also reduce the number of elective courses required for admission.

Ms. Schnarr MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Reports of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning proposals from the College of Pharmacy, to revise the admission requirements for the Doctor of Pharmacy degree; one concerning changes to the Statistics courses required, effective for the Fall 2021 intake, and one concerning changes to the Chemistry and elective courses required, effective for the Fall 2022 intake.

CARRIED

6. Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation

a) RE: Final Report and Recommendations, Teaching and Course Evaluation Review Sub-Committee Page 772

Dr. Torchia said that, at its meeting on March 12, 2020, the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation (SCIE) had considered the *Final Report and Recommendations, Teaching and Course Evaluation Review Sub-Committee*, which he had co-chaired with Dr. Hiebert-Murphy. Dr. Torchia said the Sub-committee had: reviewed the literature on various topics concerning teaching and course evaluations; undertaken additional study of The Ryerson Decision¹ and potential for bias in, and utility of, student ratings of instruction (SRIs); held thirteen focus groups, to seek input from members of the University community. The Sub-committee had also sought feedback from the University of Manitoba Faculty

¹ Ryerson University v Ryerson Faculty Association, 2018 CanLII 58446 (ONLA)

Association, which did provide its response, and the Canadian Union of Public Employees, which did not.

Dr. Torchia said the Sub-committee had made twelve recommendations, as detailed in the *Final Report*. It had arrived at a number of conclusions, including that SRIs: should not be the primary piece of data used in tenure and promotion decisions regarding teaching effectiveness; represented students' reflections on the effectiveness of teaching but were not a measure of teaching effectiveness. The Sub-committee also agreed that: SRIs should only be used to support and inform any summative review of teaching effectiveness when combined with other approaches; multisource methods of evaluation allowed for bias related to one type of evaluation to be mitigated by other methods; potential bias could be addressed through other means, including education of instructors, deans, heads, and students about the potential for bias and the limitations of using one instrument.

Dr. Torchia said there had been significant discussion at SCIE about different aspects of the *Final Report* and the recommendations. Some members had concerns about the evaluative use of SRI results in the tenure and promotion process, given the biases understood to exist. The Committee had recognized that a review of the use of SRIs in tenure and promotion processes was not part of the Sub-committee's mandate. Rather, the use of SRIs in tenure and promotion processes was a matter of collective agreements and individual units' tenure and promotion guidelines. The vote on the motion to endorse the recommendations of the Sub-committee to Senate had carried with the Chair's vote to resolve a tie, in order to allow for a discussion at Senate. The vote on a motion to recommend the proposed SRI instrument, to replace the Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ), had carried unanimously.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve a revised instrument for Student Ratings of Instruction, as described in the *Final Report and Recommendations, Teaching and Course Evaluation Review Sub-committee*, effective upon Senate approval.

Dr. Hiebert-Murphy said the Sub-committee recognized that the use of SRIs in tenure and promotion processes was contentious. It had reviewed recent arbitrations and the literature and had reached some reasonable conclusions, which it had offered together with the twelve recommendations that were in line with its mandate.

Professor Austin-Smith said she could not support the motion, as it was put. She expressed her appreciation for the Sub-committee's work, including its efforts to gather feedback from various stakeholders, and recognized the important need to identify a new instrument to evaluate teaching effectiveness, for instructors to have feedback from students and for students to have input into how they experience their education. She said she would not feel comfortable supporting the Sub-committee's recommendations, given these did not address concerns about the use of

SRI in tenure and promotion processes, at fundamental points in individuals' careers, and given the documented problem of bias in the use of SRI instruments, which discriminated against women, racialized academics, persons with disabilities, and Indigenous persons. This was particularly problematic given the lack of a campus-wide education program to address potential bias of students, instructors, heads, deans, and members of tenure and promotion review committees, in the use of SRI instruments, which was envisioned in the *Final Report* as a way to address potential bias.

Professor Austin-Smith said it was incumbent upon Senate not to allow bias, which it knew to be reproduced in a number of places in society, to be reproduced by the highest academic body of the University. She argued that Senate should stand behind the institution's principles to reduce and undo the damaging effects of discrimination and bias when it could. She contended that SRIs must not be used in the career-defining moments of tenure and promotion decisions, observing that the arbitrator in The Ryerson Decision had concluded that SRIs could be used for various purposes but not for tenure and promotion.

Dr. Torchia said The Ryerson Decision indicated that SRI results could not be used in evaluations of teaching effectiveness in tenure and promotion processes and the Sub-committee agreed with that. He and Dr. Hiebert-Murphy reiterated that it was not part of the Sub-committee's mandate to study, discuss, interpret, or make recommendations regarding the use of SRIs in tenure and promotion. The utility of SRIs in tenure and promotion decisions was governed by individual units' tenure and promotion guidelines and collective agreements. The Sub-committee had recommended that the SRI should continue to be used as one component of a multi-component approach to instructor formative feedback.

Dr. Torchia acknowledged that the University did not have an educational program in place to address bias in the use of SRIs. The utility of the current SEEQ instrument, including how it could and should be applied, was covered in workshops for academic administrators offered by the Office of Provost and Vice-President (Academic). The Sub-committee recognized that a mechanism would need to be developed to provide students with information on the potential for bias and the purpose of the SRI instrument.

Professor Prentice raised a concern that the Sub-committee's review of the literature did not appear to have included studies concerning mechanisms for addressing bias in the use of SRIs, including measures to mitigate against biases. Rather, the *Final Report* appeared to rely on a sort of optimism that people could be educated and, therefore, biases could be excluded. Given this, she was also concerned about adopting a new SRI instrument, if due consideration perhaps had not been given to this particular body of research.

Dr. Hiebert-Murphy confirmed that, although these were not cited in the list of references included in the *Final Report*, the Sub-committee had

reviewed the literature on measures to address bias. Some of those considerations resulted in particular recommendations, including the recommendation to adopt the SRI currently in use at the University of Toronto.

Professor Gabbert said he shared Professor Austin-Smith's concerns that, given the difficulties with biases, the results of SRIs should not be used to make summative decisions about tenure and promotion or in performance reviews. He argued that the language in the first bulleted item in observation 6, in the Report of SCIE, opened the way for the use of SRIs as part of the summative review process in tenure and promotion decisions, even if it was only to support and inform the process. He was concerned that the Sub-committee would come to this conclusion about how SRI data should be used to support and inform decisions of significant importance to faculty members' careers without demonstrating that the proposed SRI instrument would not perpetuate discrimination. Referring to the fifth bulleted item in observation 6, Professor Gabbert observed that it was not clear how possible bias would be addressed through education, which would be a significant task to undertake in an effective way, given the range of matters about which students were biased that extended beyond matters of gender and race.

Professor Gabbert said the Final Report, itself, was a concern given the tendency in tenure and promotion and performance reviews, to treat quantitative results from SRI instruments tended as an unproblematic metric, with some sort of accuracy and validity that gives them priority over all other documentation in individuals' teaching dossiers.

Dr. Torchia replied that, while the Sub-committee had concluded that SRIs should only support and inform any summative review process, the recommendations that Senate would be asked to endorse included a recommendation that an SRI should be used for formative feedback only and that SRIs should not be used independently but should be one component of a multi-component approach to formative feedback, which might also include peer assessment, teaching portfolios and other evidence of teaching. He agreed that education on bias in the use of SRIs would be a significant step that would require a multi-prong approach similar to the one used to educate hiring committees about bias.

Professor Gabbert suggested that, if the Sub-committee was not recommending that SRI results be used for summative purposes, this would need to be clearly laid out in the committee's conclusions, as reflected in the *Final Report* and the first bulleted point in observation 6 of the Report of SCIE, in order that the views of the Sub-committee were clear in the Senate record.

Professor Miller said numerous studies have demonstrated that individuals teaching large lecture courses are rated lower than those who teach smaller courses and that women, minorities, women from minority groups, and anyone teaching on topics of white privilege and anti-racism, are rated significantly lower than their colleagues. She suggested SRI

instruments can be useful to instructors, to personally evaluate the impact of their courses but were not valid for purposes of tenure and promotion, for reasons already identified by others at the meeting. Professor Miller said she would like to see a narrower use of the SRI instrument than was laid out in the *Final Report*.

Professor Schmidt said she would echo the concerns already raised regarding the *Final Report*. She asked why the membership of the Sub-committee had not included an expert in educational assessment and assessment of teaching and professional practice. She was also concerned that the proposed SRI instrument would not substantively address concerns with these types of instruments, generally. She questioned the utility of the instrument as a source of formative input given that it would be used predominantly at the end of a course and, if were to be administered at different points in a course, it was not clear how it would work in courses offered in a condensed delivery format prior to students completing field or practicum placements. Professor Schmidt suggested the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (the Centre) might promote more progressive approaches to improve professional practice and teaching, including to assist instructors to adopt various ways to solicit student feedback to inform their practice, rather than relying on more proscriptive measures, including SRI instruments that are biased and problematic.

Dr. Torchia said Dr. De Jaeger, Educational Specialist – Research, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, who had expertise in assessments, had assisted the Sub-committee. He agreed that using an SRI instrument only at the end of a course was not the ideal way to gather formative feedback, and the Centre encourages instructors to gather formative feedback throughout their teaching experience. The software that would be available for the proposed SRI instrument, would allow instructors to seek feedback from students at any point in a course and to create questions on specific items for they might want to receive feedback.

Dean Taylor said with respect to the motion, to replace the SEEQ with a new SRI instrument, and the Sub-committee's fourth recommendation, to adopt the SRI currently used at the University of Toronto, with the addition of two open-ended feedback questions. The SEEQ was outdated and needed to be replaced. Dean Taylor observed that Senators who had spoken against the motion had not identified what their concerns with the proposed SRI instrument were. Dean Taylor said he was a member of the Sub-committee, which had reviewed the proposed instrument. The proposed SRI instrument was superior to the SEEQ and he said, on that basis, he would vote in favour of the motion.

Dean Taylor commented, with respect to The Ryerson Decision, that the arbitrator's award concerned the use of averages to compare faculty members to each other, which was not the practice at the University of Manitoba. Also, the Ryerson Faculty Association and the arbitrator had both agreed that student evaluations of teaching have a role in personnel

decisions. Moreover, the arbitrator had said that, while the Faculty/Course Surveys, which was the particular instrument used at Ryerson University, could not be used to measure teaching effectiveness, they could be used more broadly in tenure and promotion.

Dr. Mondor indicated he would support the motion, which was to replace the SEEQ with a proposed SRI instrument. The proposed instrument would be more flexible, including because it would provide the ability to evaluate courses at a variety of levels, including the graduate level, and appeared to be an improvement over the SEEQ. He observed that no specific criticisms of the proposed instrument had been identified during Senate's discussion of the recommendation. He agreed other issues raised in the discussion were important and might require further conversation with respect to the way in which SRIs may or may not be used.

Mr. Dowie observed that there was no discussion in the *Final Report* to recognize the distinction between graduate- and undergraduate-level teaching. He remarked that the SEEQ was very undergraduate-centric and that some instructors who had strengths in undergraduate teaching were less skilled in teaching graduate courses.

Referring to the *University of Toronto's Cascaded Course Evaluation Framework: Validation Study of the Institutional Composite Mean (ICM)*, Centre for Teaching and Support & Innovation, 2018, Professor Prentice asked how the Sub-committee had reckoned with the finding that the average response rate across course sections was 42 percent, which she suggested was troublingly low.

Dr. Torchia replied that, different than at the University of Toronto, which had students complete the SRI outside of class through the learning management system, the University of Manitoba administered the SEEQs during a class, which resulted in better response rates that were typically 70 – 73 percent. The proposed SRI would be completed digitally, but would continue to be administered during classes.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate endorse *Final Report and Recommendations, Teaching and Course Evaluation Review Sub-committee*.

Recalling the distinctions Dean Taylor had made with respect to The Ryerson Decision, Professor Gabbert suggested it would be important to consider the differences between the situation at Ryerson and the University of Manitoba, given what he viewed as ambiguities in the language of the *Final Report*.

Professor Gabbert MOVED, seconded by Professor Schmidt, THAT the *Final Report and Recommendations, Teaching and Course*

Evaluation Review Sub-committee be referred back to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation for further consideration.

Professor Schultz said she appreciated the work that had gone into the Sub-committee's report, including its recommendation for a new SRI instrument. She proposed that, when the report was revised, it might articulate a plan to review and evaluate the new instrument, to determine whether it was meeting the intended objectives. Dr. Torchia agreed this was a matter SCIE could undertake to consider.

Professor Schultz proposed that a mechanism might be developed for instructors, who had received inappropriate comments, to make a complaint, so the University would have a record of instances in which SRIs were not used appropriately.

The Chair called for a vote on the motion to refer the Report back to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation.

CARRIED

b) RE: Revised Policies and Procedures for the Undergraduate Medical Education Program, Max Rady College of Medicine

i) Examination Results

Page 822

Dr. Torchia said SCIE met on February 13, 2020, to consider several proposals from the Max Rady College of Medicine, concerning proposed changes to examination policies for the Undergraduate Medical Education program. The policy on *Examination Results* would be revised to update the definition for the National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME) Exam, as discussed under item III (7)(a), as well as the definitions for the Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE-type) and Comprehensive Clinical Exam (CCE). Revised definitions for the various examinations described changes to the way in which the pass mark would be determined, which, in turn, required revisions to various sections of the policy to reflect the new pass mark.

ii) Promotion and Failure

Page 839

Dr. Torchia said the policy on *Promotion and Failure* would be revised to reflect the revised definitions for the NBME, OSCE-type, and CCE examinations. Sections 3.1 and 3.9 would be revised to clarify that successful completion of Years 1 and 2, in the Pre-Clerkship, required successful completion of all of the required coursework in a given year in order to proceed to the next year.

iii) **Mid-Point In-Training Evaluation (MITER) and Final In-Training Evaluation (FITER) Preparation, Distribution, and Completion and Essential Clinical Presentation (ECP) Preparation, Distribution, Audit, and Remediation**

Page 863

Dr. Torchia said the policy on *Mid-Point In-Training Evaluation (MITER) and Final In-Training Evaluation (FITER) Preparation, Distribution and Completion and Essential Clinical Presentation (ECP) Preparation, Distribution, Audit, and Remediation* would be revised to require that notification of a fail or borderline pass on a FITER be given within five working days and that electronic submission of all FITERs must occur within six weeks of the completion of the rotation. The changes were required to meet accreditation standards.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revisions to the following policies for the Undergraduate Medical Education program, Max Rady College of Medicine, as amended, effective August 1, 2020, with the exception that the revised definition for the National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME) Exam, in section 2.7 of the first two policies would take effect upon Senate approval:

- Examination Results policy, including to rename the policy “Assessment Results;”
- Promotion and Failure policy;
- Mid-Point In-Training Evaluation (MITER) and Final In-Training Evaluation (FITER) Preparation, Distribution and Completion and Essential Clinical Presentation (ECP) Preparation, Distribution, Audit, and Remediation policy.

CARRIED

c) **RE: Modification of Regulation on Time Limits and Lapse of Credit, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences**

Page 871

Dr. Torchia said SCIE had met on March 12, 2020, to consider a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences to modify its regulation concerning *Time Limits and Lapse of Credit*. The regulation would be revised, by adding the word “normally,” to allow for exemptions to the usual restriction against allowing students to count courses completed more than ten years prior to the award of the degree toward that degree. The proposed modification reflects current practice within the Faculty and would obviate the need for manual overrides.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning the modification of a regulation on *Time*

Limits and Lapse of Credit, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, effective September 1, 2020.

CARRIED

- d) **RE: Revised Regulation on Available Minors in Departments and Faculties, Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources** Page 874

Dr. Torchia said that, at the same meeting, SCIE consider a proposal from the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources to revise its regulation concerning *Available Minors in Departments and Faculties*, to allow students in the Bachelor of Art (Honours) in Geography to complete a Minor.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning a revision to the regulation on *Available Minors in Departments and Faculties*, Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources, effective September 1, 2020.

CARRIED

- e) **RE: Revised Academic Regulations, Baccalauréat ès sciences avec majeure conjointe en biochimie-microbiologie, et volet coopératif, Université de Saint-Boniface** Page 876

Dr. Torchia said that, at the meeting on March 12th, SCIE considered revisions to the academic regulations for the Baccalauréat ès sciences avec majeure conjointe en biochimie-microbiologie, et volet coopératif, offered by the Université de Saint-Boniface. The academic regulations for the B.Sc. conjointe en biochimie-microbiologie would be revised to clarify that students would be eligible to enter the program following successful completion of a minimum of 48 credit hours. The regulations for the co-operative option (volet coopératif), in particular, would be revised to require that students obtain a minimum overall score of 2 on the assessment of scientific English language skills and complete any recommended training to strengthen their skills. Students would also be required to demonstrate professional behaviour in their co-op placement. Where a student chose to voluntarily withdraw from the co-operative option, the withdrawal would take effect immediately.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revised academic regulations for the Baccalauréat ès sciences avec majeure conjointe en biochimie-microbiologie, et volet coopératif, Université de Saint-Boniface effective September 1, 2020.

CARRIED

7. **Reports of the Senate Committee on University Research**

- a) **RE: Periodic Review of Legal Research Institute** Page 885

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research concerning the periodic review of the Legal Research Institute, including a recommendation that the Institute be renewed for a term of five years, from May 31, 2020 through May 30, 2025.

CARRIED

- b) **RE: Proposal to Establish a Professorship in Anesthesiology** Page 888

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate recommend that the Board of Governors approve a proposal to establish a Professorship in Anesthesiology.

CARRIED

8. **Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations** Page 895
[May 1, 2020]

Professor Edwards referred Senators to the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations, with recommendations to fill vacancies on various Senate 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 May 1, 2020].

CARRIED

X **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS** - none

Professor Miller informed Senators that the Summer Institute for Indigenous Content would start on May 19, from 9 a.m. to noon, and would continue on Tuesday mornings for the subsequent ten weeks. Those who were interested in participating were invited to contact Professor Miller by email.

XI **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION**

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees**
[April 14, 2020]

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.

XII ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 36, together with the agenda, pages 1 to 910, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on May 13, 2020.