



**Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Governors
Open Session
November 21, 2006**

The meeting was held at 4:00 p.m. in Room 160, Extended Education Complex

Present: T. Sargeant, Chair
J. Leclerc, Secretary

J. Anderson	W. Anderson	D. Ames	A. Black
J. Charles	R. Dhalla	E. Gordon	R. Gotthilf
S. Hennessey	J. Hoskins	J. Lederman	H. Milan
W. Norrie	D. Ruth	G. Sran	T. Strutt
E. Szathmáry	S. Van Schie	D. Ward	

Assessors Present:

M. Gallant	T. Moyle	J. Whiteley
------------	----------	-------------

Officials Present:

E. Goldie	C. Keachie	R. Kerr	J. Keselman
D. McCallum			

Regrets:

S. Narine	S. Reddy	J. Simons
-----------	----------	-----------

1. Announcements

The Chair welcomed Board members to the meeting and introduced Mr. Garry Sran, President of the University of Manitoba Students' Union (UMSU), Ms. Rachel Gotthilf, Vice-President (External) of UMSU and Ms. Meghan Gallant, President of the Graduate Students' Association (GSA), who gave a presentation to the Board of Governors on the programs and services offered by UMSU and the GSA.

2. Minutes

2.1 Open Minutes

It was moved by Dr. Norrie, seconded by Ms Van Schie:

THAT the minutes of the September 19, 2006 Open Session meeting be approved as

circulated.

CARRIED

2.2 Business Arising

Mrs. McCallum referenced page 10 of the agenda, where she provided the Board with the response to two questions regarding the 'General Expenses' shown in the 2007-2008 Operating Budget Estimates. The first question related to what was included in General Expenses. It was noted that General Expenses include any items that are not attributable to any individual academic or support unit, and a list of such items was provided. Mrs. McCallum also noted the other question was why the budget in 2006-2007 was so much higher than the previous year, and it was noted that this was due to debt servicing costs being included in the budget.

3. From Executive Committee - none

4. From Academic Affairs Committee

4.1 Report of the Senate Committee on Awards (August 31, 2006)

It was moved by Dr. Anderson, seconded by Ms Milan:

THAT the Board of Governors approve the 10 new awards, 22 award amendments and 2 award withdrawals as set out in the report of the Senate Committee on Awards [dated August 31, 2006.

CARRIED

4.2 Proposal of new Department - Biological Sciences

Mr. Hennessy referenced page 30 of the agenda material. He asked what are the exact costs or resources or savings that will result from the amalgamation of the Departments of Botany and Zoology to become the Department of Biological Sciences. Dr. Kerr responded that there may be minor savings to bring the 2 units together, noting that cost was not the driving issue for the re-organization. He noted that the advantages of bringing the two departments together were academic and programmatic in nature, and it was hoped that having faculty in the like disciplines of Botany and Zoology working together in the same department would encourage synergies.

Mr. Hennessy asked for clarification regarding the two department heads. He understood that the two department heads would be removed from department head status and their stipends would be reduced. Dr. Kerr responded that there would be now a single department with a single department head with one stipend. He noted that it would be a different stipend than that from the previous department stipends because it will be a larger department. The present department heads will continue as faculty members with a new department head appointed. Dr. Kerr indicated that what the present department heads will lose is their stipend (approximately \$3,000-\$4,000 per annum). Therefore, the cost-saving will be that there will only be one stipend to pay instead of two. He reiterated though, that the merger was initiated by the faculty members in the two departments and the Biological Sciences program as an opportunity to work more closely together. Dr. Szathmáry added that the a recommendation to

consider departmental mergers and re-organization in the life sciences stems back to the 1998 report of the Task Force on Strategic Planning.

It was moved by Dr. Anderson, seconded by Ruth:

THAT the Board of Governors approve the proposal of the Faculty of Science to create a new Department of Biological Sciences, through the unification of the Department of Botany, the Department of Zoology and the Introductory Biology Program [dated September 1, 2006] [as endorsed by the Faculty Council of Science on September 1, 2006, the Senate Executive on September 20, 2006 and as approved by Senate on October 4, 2006].

CARRIED

5. From Finance and Administration Committee - none

6. From Governance Committee

6.1 Addition to Board of Governors meeting rules

Ms. Lederman noted that the proposal for resolutions in writing allows a resolution in writing to be deemed valid if it is supported by two thirds of the Board, while the standard for corporate law is that it has to be signed by every member of the Board. Ms. Lederman asked why there was a deviation from the corporate standard? Mr. Leclerc noted that in researching the resolution in writing wording, the standard that was used was that of other universities of similar in size to the University of Manitoba who have provisions for the resolution in writing.

It was moved by Dr. Szathmáry, seconded by Ms Van Schie:

THAT the Board of Governors approve the additions to the Board Meeting Rules regarding meetings via electronic means, as presented.

CARRIED

7. New Business

7.1 Committee of Election of a Chancellor for a term from June 1, 2007 to May 31, 2010

Dr. Norrie declared a conflict of interest and therefore did not discuss or vote on this item.

Mr. Leclerc commented that this process takes places every three years - as the position of Chancellor term opens for nomination and election. There is an election held by the Committee of Election. This Committee is comprised of all the members of Senate and of the Board of Governors meeting in joint session with the sole function of electing a Chancellor. Mr. Leclerc further noted that in past-practice, an *ad hoc* committee of the Committee of Election consisting of two members of the Board (typically the Chair and Vice-Chair) and two members of the Senate is established. They meet to discuss the process and prepare the rules and make recommendations related to the process of electing the Chancellor to the Board and the Senate. Mr. Leclerc also commented that the committee will receive nominations. The election is typically held the first Wednesday of March or April. He also noted also that Chancellor Norrie is eligible for re-election and has indicated that he will be willing to stand for re-election.

It was moved by Dr. Norrie, seconded by Ms Van Schie:

THAT:

1. **Subject to concurrence by Senate, an *ad hoc* Committee of the Committee of Election, consisting of two members of the Board of Governors and two members of the Senate, be established to:**
 - a. **Perform the functions required under the procedures for the Committee of Election which were used for the 2004 Chancellor election (the nomination of the Chancellor, the method of election, the date of election and the announcement of the elected Chancellor);**
 - b. **Recommend to the Board and Senate on any issues which require consideration prior to the meeting of the Committee of Election (including an appropriate timetable for receipt of nominations and conducting the election).**

2. **The Board of Governors name its two appointees to the *ad hoc* Committee.**

CARRIED

The Chair called for nominations to the *ad hoc* Committee.

It was moved by Ms. Lederman, seconded by Dr. Ruth:

THAT the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board of Governors be appointed to serve on the *ad hoc* Committee of the Committee of Election.

CARRIED

The Board of Governors received the following items for information:

- 9.1 Program Proposal: Ph.D. in Applied Health Sciences - Faculty of Graduate Studies

- 12.1 President's Report

Dr. Szathmáry augmented her report highlighting several issues. She brought to the Board's attention the matter of the Accountability Website accessible from the University of Manitoba's homepage. The page provides a number of tables which address the nature of the student body, student performance, research, and university finances. Dr. Szathmáry also noted that this page provides documents that have long been available, such as the Annual Financial Report, the Annual Report of the Board of Governors.

Dr. Szathmáry informed that Board that she and Drs. Keselman and Kerr attended a conference in Banff on *Building the University of the 21st Century* on November 12-14, 2006. The themes of the conference were: "How do universities remain accountable to funders and the public; and Incentives and impediments for junior faculty wishing to engage in more multi- and inter-disciplinary research and how to promote these interactions, and Universities and changes needed to move forward for the 21st century." The conference was hosted by the University of Calgary and the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR). She felt that out

of this conference will come a visit to the University of Manitoba by *Toronto Star* science reporter Mr. Peter Calamai who was a keynote speaker at the conference.

Ms. Lederman noted that she felt the themes raised in the conference were interesting policy questions for a Board. She asked if an overview of the themes could be provided for the Board's consideration and discussion.

Dr. Szathmáry responded that there were two issues discussed at the conference; one was the matter of accountability in which she gave a 10 minute presentation on accountability in Universities. There were three other speakers representing the federal government and the accountability measures that are required due to a variety of federal programs primarily research programs that provide funding to the University. She also noted that subsequent to accountability, the issue discussed was inter-disciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity within Universities. Dr. Szathmáry indicated that she felt that the real issue for the University of Manitoba into the 21st century is that although a disciplinary model is the most familiar way to teach and learn: in fact, problems as they present themselves tend to be not quite so discipline-specific. Therefore, the major problems for universities and for the societies in which they are embedded are multi-disciplinary; how do you then build truly successful multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary enterprises given that it requires a number of changes that are not simply academic.

12.2 Report of the UMSU President

Mr. Sran noted that UMSU recently held its Annual General Meeting at which topics discussed included audited financial statements, initiatives that were accomplished during the past summer, in addition to UMSU goals for the upcoming year. Mr. Sran commented that UMSU recently worked with the University Food Service Committee on the town hall meetings, ensuring students made their concerns heard. He also mentioned that several members of the UMSU Executive will be attending the National General Meeting of the Canadian Federation of Students on November 22, 2006. Mr. Sran indicated that members of UMSU attended the provincial throne speech. He also mentioned that UMSU participated with the University of Manitoba Campus cleanup day; the University provided \$1,195 to several student groups for their involvement and participation of this event. Regarding the Bisons football team, Mr. Sran commented that UMSU endeavored to gather student participation to attend Bison football games. On behalf of UMSU, Mr. Sran thanked the Bisons for a great season.

13. Annual Progress Report

The Board of Governors and the Senate approved *Building for a Bright Future* in June, 2003. The Plan outlined five institutional priorities for success, and requested that the President report to the Board and the Senate annually on progress towards meeting the institutional priorities by Faculties, Schools and Administrative Units.

Mr. Hennessey referenced page 77 regarding the Faculty of Law (The Aboriginal Recruitment Task Group commissioned to create a video aimed at encouraging Aboriginal youth to start thinking about university while still in junior high school). Mr. Hennessey asked if this initiative was limited specifically in the Faculty of Law? Dr. Szathmáry responded that to her knowledge yes, it was a project specifically undertaken by the Faculty of Law.

Mr. Hennessey referenced page 83 "The Provost's Aboriginal Advisory Committee" - it was

noted that this Committee continues to meet with Aboriginal units on camps to ensure that the University is the first choice of Aboriginal students. He asked if there are indicators that this still holds true? Dr. Szathmáry responded that yes, being the University of first choice for Aboriginal Students is still a priority, and that there are indicators to demonstrate that the University is making progress in this area. One of the indicators is the increase in Aboriginal students on campus; however, the difficulty is because this is a matter of self-declaration, it is not known whether there has been an absolute growth in Aboriginal students at the University or whether more simply students are declaring Aboriginal ancestry each year.

Mr. Hennessey asked if perhaps the University should consider creating the same type of recruitment video that the Faculty of Law has made? Dr. Szathmáry responded that there are different initiatives in various faculties being undertaken. Regarding a University video, she felt that it would not be possible to make a short enough video that will address all of the diversity that exists on the campus therefore focused videos undertaken by various faculties and groups on campus will no doubt be more effective in the long run in terms of recruiting Aboriginal students.

Ms. Lederman asked to what extent is their interaction between administration and the faculties in terms of monitoring and following up on the plan or is it just a reporting; is there ongoing engagement? Dr. Szathmáry responded that it is a matter of reporting; there are a lot of the initiatives coming out of faculties are things that they are initiating on the academic front and they would not necessarily be the business of the Board. It is simply a reporting mechanism at this point. Mrs. McCallum added that every year when the units submit their strategic resource plans they group their requests under each of the 5 institutional priorities. When they come to present to the President and Vice-Presidents, the unit heads identify which of the strategic initiatives any particular proposed new venture is going to support. Each year, the Strategic Resource Planning process asks units to measure their performance against previously stated strategic priorities. In that sense, there is a review and monitoring on an annual basis.

It was moved by Dr. Norrie, seconded by Ms Van Schie:

THAT the Board of Governors move into Closed and Confidential session.

CARRIED

It was moved by Dr. Anderson, seconded by Ms Charles:

THAT the meeting adjourn.

CARRIED

Chair

University Secretary