

**Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Room E3-262 Engineering and Information Technology Complex**

---

**Members Present**

Dr. D. Barnard  
Chair  
Dr. C. Adams  
Ms. K. Adams  
Prof. S. Alward  
Prof. B. Amiro  
Prof. G. Anderson  
Prof. J. Anderson  
Prof. H. Aukema  
Ms. F. Bakhtiari  
Dean J. Beddoes  
Dean M. Benarroch  
Prof. P. Blunden  
Prof. T. Booth  
Very Rev. R. Bozyk  
Prof. D. Brewin  
Ms. M. Brolley  
Dr. D. Brothwell  
Prof. D. Brown  
Mr. R. Buchanan  
Prof. F. Burczynski  
Prof. A. Calder  
Prof. M. Campbell  
Prof. P. Cattini  
Mr. G. Chappellaz  
Prof. T. Chen  
Prof. A. Chiu  
Prof. N. Chow  
Mr. Z. Courtemanche  
Dean N. Davies  
Dean E. Dawe  
Dean J. Doering  
Prof. M. Edwards  
Mr. C. Ekenna  
Prof. E. Etcheverry  
Prof. A. Farenhorst  
Mr. L. Ford  
Prof. D. Funk  
Prof. M. Gabbert  
Prof. J. Gilchrist  
Ms. S. Gottheil  
Dean N. Halden  
Prof. J. Hughes  
Prof. P. Hultin

Ms. E. Hunzinger  
Ms. M. Igweagu  
Prof. T. Ivanco  
Dr. D. Jayas  
Ms. I. Kaur  
Mr. J. Kearsey  
Dr. J. Keselman  
Prof. J. Kettner  
Prof. W. Kinsner  
Mr. P. Kochan  
Prof. S. Kouritzin  
Prof. R. Lobdell  
Prof. D. MacPherson  
Prof. D. McMillan  
Mr. S. Mack  
Dean D. Mandzuk  
Ms. V. Marriott  
Mr. G. Mejicanos  
Prof. A. Menkis  
Prof. T. Mondor  
Prof. J. Morrill  
Dean J. Mulvale  
Dean B. O'Connell  
Mr. E. Okeke  
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette  
Prof. F. Parkinson  
Mr. A. Pawlak  
Dr. C. Piotrowski  
Prof. T. Podolsky  
Prof. D. Polyzois  
Ms. E. Popowich  
Dean B. Postl  
Prof. S. Prentice  
Prof. C. Rocke  
Dr. H. Sector  
Ms. T. Silva  
Mr. J. Silverstein  
Prof. D. Smyth  
Prof. B. Southern  
Prof. M. Steggle  
Dean R. Stern  
Prof. L. Strachan  
Ms. J. Tan  
Prof. R. Tate  
Dean J. Taylor

Mr. A. Thapa  
Prof. C. Trott  
Mr. A. Turnbull  
Mr. M. Vasconcelos  
Prof. P. Venkatesh  
Dean L. Wallace  
Mr. B. Warnakulasooriya  
Dean M. Whitmore  
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld  
Prof. A. Young  
Mr. K. Zeid  
Mr. J. Leclerc,  
University  
Secretary  
Dr. S. Coyston,  
Recording  
Secretary

**Assessors Present**

Mr. J. Adams  
Ms. S. Ally  
Dr. J. Blatz  
Dr. D. Collins  
Mr. S. Dorge  
Ms. A. Ducas  
Dr. G. Glavin  
Prof. B. Hallman  
Prof. B. Hann  
Prof. T. Kucera  
Mr. N. Marnoch  
Prof. K. Matheos  
Mr. M. Rahimian  
Dr. J. Ristock  
Dr. D. Stewart  
Ms. D. Young

**Regrets**

Prof. J. Asadoorian  
Prof. M. Brabston  
Mr. G. Csepregi  
Prof. R. Desai  
Prof. J. Embree

Rectrice R. Gagné  
Mr. J. Hart  
Prof. R. Hechter  
Prof. D. Lussier  
Prof. D. Mann  
Dean L. Turnbull  
Prof. L. Wang

**Absent**

Prof. M. Araji  
Ms. K. Daaca  
Prof. B. Elias  
Prof. V. Keown  
Prof. L. Landrum  
Ms. M. Leaf  
Ms. B. Lewicki  
Mr. J. Patterson  
Dr. M. Torchia  
Dean M. Trevan  
Prof. H. Unruh

**Also Present**

Mr. J. Danakas  
Ms. D. Dunbar  
Ms. C. Ferreira  
Ms. S. Foster  
Ms. S. Gagnon  
Mr. L. Howard  
Ms. S. Levene  
Ms. A. McMullin  
Ms. K. Mcquarrie  
Smith  
Mr. C. Pierce  
Ms. I. Simon  
Ms. N. Subotincic  
Ms. P. Trupish  
Ms. B. Usick  
Ms. S. Utsunomiya  
Ms. K. Woloschuk  
Ms. S. Zelenitsky

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Arlene Young, Faculty of Arts.

*The committee agreed to deal with item III (1) Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees, at the end of the agenda.*

**I CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,  
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES - OCTOBER 2013**

Page 3

Ms. Gottheil said the Faculty of Graduate Studies was recommending that a student (6751298) be granted a Master of Public Administration degree notwithstanding a deficiency. She said the Faculty of Graduate Studies regulation states that a student in the comprehensive examination route must complete 12 credit hours at the 7000 level or above. The student had completed 9 credit hours at the 7000 level and 3 credit hours at the 6000 level. The Department had understood a 6000 level course normally offered through the Master of Business Administration program could be counted toward the program as a 7000 level course and had seen no deficiencies in the student's program.

**Professor Young MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the candidate recommended for a degree notwithstanding a deficiency be approved.**

**CARRIED**

A copy of the list of graduands was available at the meeting for examination by members of Senate.

**Professor Young MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the list of graduands provided to the University Secretary by the Registrar be approved, subject to the right of Deans and Directors to initiate late changes with the Registrar up to October 4, 2013.**

**CARRIED**

**II REPORT ON MEDALS AND PRIZES  
TO BE AWARDED AT THE OCTOBER CONVOCATION**

This report was available at the front table in the Senate Chamber for examination by members of Senate.

**Professor Young MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the report on medals and prizes provided to the University Secretary be approved by Senate.**

**CARRIED**

**IV MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE**

**1. Amendment to Academic Schedule - 2013/2014**

Page 4

**Professor Young MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve an amendment to the Academic Schedule – 2013/2014.**

**CARRIED**

## **V MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

- 1, **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards  
[August 27, 2013]** Page 5
2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review  
RE: Undergraduate and Graduate Program Reviews  
[August 28, 2013]** Page 9
3. **Statement of Intent: Entry-to-Practice Doctor of Pharmacy** Page 20
4. **Request for Suspension of Admission in Two  
Human Ecology Programs** Page 28

The Chair said a request had been received from the Faculty of Human Ecology to suspend admission to two programs, the Bachelor of Science in Textile Sciences and the Bachelor of Human Ecology General Human Ecology. He said the request had been provided to Senate for consultation prior to the President making a decision.

## **VI REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT** Page 35

## **VII QUESTION PERIOD**

Senators are reminded that questions shall normally be submitted in writing to the University Secretary no later than 10:00 a.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

The following question was received from Mr. Zachary Courtemanche, Student Senator, Faculty of Law:

Last month a question was posed to Senate regarding security of our email servers. Over the past month I have received feedback from my constituents regarding similar issues. While unrelated to security, the email policy's required changeover to the "myumanitoba" service has caused issues among my constituents relating to emails not arriving to inboxes. While some bugs always need to be worked out in any changeover process, this could understandably create academic repercussions to students attempting to communicate with professors. Can the relevant authority provide us with an indication of how this process is proceeding?

Mr. Kochan said that, without information on the specific issues, it was difficult to respond. He acknowledged that, as would be the case with any change to a new server, there are some issues to be worked out. He said support is available to students through the computer help desk (IST Help and Solutions Centre). He indicated his willingness to address specific concerns that Mr. Courtemanche might send to him.

The following questions were received from Professor Burczynski, Faculty of Pharmacy:

1. The updated August 2013 proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences was only made available to affected Faculties last week. This document exposes a plan not evident in the original proposal voted on by Faculties; that being

relinquishing all significant aspects of governance and resource allocation to the Health Sciences Faculty. Will Faculties and key stakeholders including the professions and accreditation bodies be given fair time to consider the significant changes in the new proposal before it is voted on by Senate or the Board of Governors?

2. The Faculties of Pharmacy and Dentistry both passed motions at Faculty Council to support collaboration in principle. However these motions included important amendments stating that "the Vice Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences does not concurrently hold the position of Dean of one of its constitutive Colleges". This is essential in avoiding conflicts of interest. Why was this critical issue, formally expressed by 2 of the 4 Faculties, not reflected in the updated August proposal?

In response to the first question, Dr. Keselman said the revised proposal had been circulated to the affected faculties and schools on September 23<sup>rd</sup>, after Senate Executive had endorsed it and before it had been circulated with the Senate agenda. She said it does not contain any changes to either the proposed governance structure or to how resources would be allocated. The only changes that had been made were to include additional information regarding resource implications and clarification of the proposed governance structure in terms of the responsibilities of faculty versus college councils. She emphasized that the governance structure is only a proposed structure. Dr. Keselman said the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC) had requested the change. She said the idea that the Faculty would be responsible for overall planning and resource allocation was initially presented at a town hall on November 15, 2012. It was restated on the page 7 of the original proposal and the same wording can be found on page 7 of the current proposal.

Dr. Keselman said the original proposal had been forwarded to Senate with a covering letter from the proponents that included the advisory votes taken at five (versus four) of the faculty and school councils. The SPPC and Senate Executive, which have endorsed the proposal to Senate, were aware of these votes at the time they considered the proposal. Dr. Keselman said she had provided the following information in an electronic message sent to the University community: an update on the status of the proposal; comments on the views of the affected units; a link to the revised proposal and covering letter containing the views of the affected units, which had been posted on the web page for the Academic Structure Initiative (ASI); an indication that she would to speak to the views of the affected units in her opening remarks to Senate concerning the proposal.

As the proposal for a Faculty of Health Sciences would be considered under item X 2(b), the Chair proposed that further discussion of these matters occur as part of the discussion of that proposal.

## **VIII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2013**

Several references to "competency examination" were amended to "comprehensive examination".

Professor Booth **MOVED**, seconded by Dean Whitmore, **THAT** the minutes of the Senate meeting held on September 4, 2013 be approved as amended.

**CARRIED**

**IX BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - none**

**X REPORTS OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE SENATE PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE**

**1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee Page 51**

Professor Young said Senate Executive met on September 18, 2013. Comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they are made.

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

**a) Oral Report from the Chair**

Ms. Ducas said the committee is currently considering a proposal to revise the curriculum of the After-Degree Bachelor of Education program.

**b) RE: a Proposal to Establish a Faculty of Health Sciences Page 52**

Dr. Barnard recalled that, in January 2012, in a communication to the University Community, he had identified the complex academic structure at the University of Manitoba as an impediment to meeting the University's objectives in teaching, research, and community service. He had suggested that the University move toward the average number of faculties at other U15 universities by 2017. Dr. Barnard said he had asked the Provost to lead this initiative, and to work, in the first instance, with the Health Sciences faculties. He thanked Dr. Keselman, the Deans, and others involved in developing the proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences.

Dr. Barnard said that, under the University of Manitoba Act, matters related to the creation or modification of faculties or schools are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors. The Act also gives Senate the power to make recommendations to the Board regarding the same. Dr. Barnard said that he had worked with the University Secretary to develop a process to structure the discussion and debate, to ensure Senate carefully considers the proposal. He thanked Senate Executive for its review and support of the process. Dr. Barnard reviewed the Process for Considering the Proposal to Establish a Faculty of Health Sciences at Senate, as set out in the document circulated with the notice of meeting and attached to the minutes of the meeting.

**Professor Young **MOVED**, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, **THAT** debate of item X(2)(b) a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences be extended to ninety-minutes.**

**CARRIED**

Dr. Kesleman outlined the process used to develop the proposal, which began with an extensive period of discussion among the health sciences deans and directors, of the risks and benefits of a more integrated structure considered in the context of key emerging trends within the academic health sciences. Thematic working groups involving representatives of each unit in the health sciences cluster created to provide advice on opportunities and challenges associated with a more integrated structure. The discussion was shaped by input from the working groups, faculty members, and students, which had been solicited through various venues over the course of several months, as described on page 58 of the agenda. An examination of the configuration of academic health sciences units at other Canadian universities had revealed that, while there is some variation, generally, the structures that exist elsewhere are more integrated than the present structure at the University of Manitoba. All discussions and analysis pointed to clear benefits of a more integrated structure and, on that basis, the proponents began to consider what such a structure might look like at this University.

Dr. Keselman said the proponents reviewed their findings and presented two options for a more integrated structure, for initial feedback and consideration, at a town hall meeting at the Bannatyne Campus in December 2012, which was attended by more than 350 people. This was followed by an extensive period of consultation with faculty, staff, and students, at more than forty meetings attended by close to 800 participants and through an ASI website that had been established to collect feedback and to respond to questions regarding the initiative. The original proposal, which was based on those consultations and feedback, had been released in April 2013.

In April and May 2013, the proponents had solicited advice and expressions of support for the proposal from the affected units. All five of the faculty and school councils voted to support the proposal in principle. Two of the faculty councils, in Dentistry and Pharmacy, expressed concerns and offered advice regarding administrative aspects of the proposal; in particular, that the Dean of the College of Medicine would not be the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty of Health Sciences. Dr. Keselman said the rationale for the dual role, which is described on page 65 of the agenda, is a pragmatic one. It recognizes that Medicine is a prominent player in the health care environment and that having the Dean of the College of Medicine also serve as the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty would allow the University to leverage this prominence for the benefit of all of the health professions. Dr. Keselman said the dual role is consistent with leadership practices at other Canadian universities, including McMaster University, the University of Western Ontario, and Queen's University, which are well known for their strengths in the health sciences. Moreover, as the new Faculty would develop itself, it would benefit from the leadership experience of the incumbent. Dr. Keselman said the revised proposal details proposed responsibilities of the college deans. She said the areas where college deans would have full accountability would be considerable including, for example, academic and professional programs within the unit and the interface with

professional bodies. The current deans and directors have made a commitment to a model of collaborative leadership where each would have a strong voice in the development of their own College and in the development of the Faculty as a whole. For these reasons, after considerable discussion and consideration of the feedback received on the matter, the proponents continue to believe that the creation of a separate administrative position of Dean and Vice-Provost would be unnecessary and that the current Dean of the Faculty of Medicine is well placed to assume the dual role. Dr. Keselman observed that the Dean and Vice-Provost would be responsible for the success of the Faculty as a whole, which could only occur if each of the constituent colleges is nurtured and supported.

Dean Postl said he was pleased to be able to present a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences. He acknowledged the other deans, directors, and staff in the office of the Provost who had been instrumental in, and collegial throughout, the development process. He said the goal of the proposal is to create an integrated structure to support inter-professional teaching, research, and engagement in the community that would bring together the strengths of the current faculties and schools involved in the proposal. The proposed Faculty would incorporate the Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy, and the School of Medical Rehabilitation as colleges. The School of Dental Hygiene would remain as a school within the College of Dentistry.

Dean Postl said the proposal comes at a time when there is increasing focus on inter-professional models of care in the health environment. It represents an effort to catch up with changes that have already occurred in the delivery systems for health care around the world. Dean Postl said there would be increasing pressure for the various health professions in the province to work collaboratively and collegially when *The Regulated Health Professions Act* is implemented. The health research enterprise, too, including the CIHR and the Tri-Council, is increasingly focused on inter-disciplinary research and research teams.

Dean Postl said the vision for the proposed Faculty is to position the University as an international leader in health professions education, research, and practice, and to achieve advances in patient care that would improve individual and public health outcomes. He said the University should not only respond to changes in the health care environment but should be leading the changes including in the areas of inter-professional education and practice, leading edge multidisciplinary research, the provision of exemplary community services and particularly those targeting underserved populations, and the training of future generations of health professionals in an environment that reflects the environment in which they would practice.

Dean Postl said there would be a strong delineation of roles of the faculty and college deans. College councils would have responsibility for the development, delivery, and administration of academic programs. College deans would have accountability for professional programs,

including academic professional programs, and other functions within their college including interfacing with alumni and professional bodies. College deans would also be involved in promotion and tenure, hiring, and personnel decisions. The faculty council would be responsible for setting the overall strategic plan and priorities for the Faculty. The faculty dean would have responsibility for general supervision of the Faculty and for setting the direction of the Faculty in collaboration with the college deans. The creation of faculty-wide administrative platforms would continue in areas such as research, graduate studies, faculty development, accreditation, student affairs, and space planning, in order to foster more integrated planning, reduce duplication, optimize resources use, and leverage maximum value from existing resources.

Dean Postl said two councils would be established to foster collaboration among the colleges. A Council of Deans, which would meet regularly to review the needs of the Faculty, and a Senior Administrative Council, which would ensure that support services were put in place. Dean Postl said, based on a suggestion from Senate Executive, the possibility of establishing a faculty executive council, to enhance program and collegial activities in what would be a large Faculty, would be explored.

Dean Postl said the establishment of the Faculty of Health Sciences is expected to: (i) accelerate the development of inter-professional education and practice models, to better prepare graduates to practice and provide services in an interdisciplinary health care environment; (ii) expand and leverage distributed models of education, to recruit and retain more health care professionals from across the province; (iii) improve and enhance research competitiveness by virtue of more holistic and integrated approach to research planning and support; (iv) enhance the ability to serve the larger community through more effective and innovative inter-professional approaches to health care; (v) lead to more effective liaisons with government and greater opportunities for partnerships; (vi) allow for more flexible programs of study; (vii) improve planning and decision-making in the academic health sciences that would facilitate further development of an academic health network; (ix) accelerate progress on each of the four pillars of the University's strategic planning framework.

Dean Postl said, pending approval of the proposal, a steering committee would be struck to further discuss future activities and structures. He said there is a strong collective will among the current deans and directors of the affected units to advance the initiative.

**Dean Postl MOVED, seconded by Professor Etcheverry, THAT Senate approve, in principle, and recommend to the Board of Governors a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences [dated August, 2013].**

Ms. Ducas said the SPPC had met a number of times to consider the proposal and had sought additional information on the resource requirements and governance structure of the proposed Faculty. She

said this information had been incorporated into the proposal before the committee. Ms. Ducas identified the various academic units that would be brought together in the proposed Faculty, as outlined in observation 2 of the Report, and briefly reviewed the respective responsibilities of the colleges and the Faculty, as set out in observation 3. Ms. Ducas reiterated that the proposal recommends that the Dean of the College of Medicine would be the founding Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty. She briefly reviewed the proposed governance structure including the respective responsibilities of the Council of Deans, Faculty Council, and College Councils, as outlined in observations 7 and 8. She said the SPPC had noted that there are issues concerning the administrative and governance structures of the proposed Faculty that would need to be considered and developed further by the academic units involved.

With respect to resource requirements, Ms. Ducas said the proposal states that the combined operating budget of the Faculty of Health Sciences (\$109.7 million as at March 31, 2013) would be sufficient to support the initial creation of the Faculty. Future resource needs would be considered in the course of the resource allocation process along with the needs of the rest of the University. The proposal also identifies one-time implementation costs of \$300,000 that would be provided from central University funds. Ms. Ducas reported that the SPPC had discussed resources needs and had acknowledged that no new space is required. The committee had observed that the relocation of Nursing to the Bannatyne Campus would require considerable resources for a new building. The proponents have indicated, however, that the relocation of Nursing is not required for the success of the proposal. The committee is of the view that, on the basis of the proposal, there are sufficient resources to undertake this transition.

Ms. Ducas said the SPPC recognizes and supports the strong academic arguments underpinning the proposal and the opportunities that the creation of a Faculty of Health Sciences, could provide for the teaching, research, and services missions of the programs in Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Medical Rehabilitation, and Dental Hygiene.

The Chair reminded members that fifteen minutes had been allotted for questions of clarification.

Professor Morrill suggested that observation 13 in the Report of the SPPC implies that, because the cost of a new building for Nursing could be avoided, it should not be counted in the evaluation of the cost of the creation of the Faculty. She said that according to the principles of capital budgeting a cost that is not incurred is not counted but a cost that is incurred is counted. She asked for an estimate of the unrestricted University funds that would be directed to the construction of a new Nursing building on the Bannatyne Campus. The Chair said, and Mr. Kochan confirmed, that there is no proposal for a new Nursing building. Given this, it is not possible to answer the question. In response to Professor Edward's assertion that plans for a new building had been on display at the Brodie Centre, Dr. Keselman said there is a Bannatyne

Campus Master Plan development process underway that is intended to sketch out future aspirations for that campus, which includes a long term plan for the relocation of Nursing to the health sciences precinct. There are no planning or resources details to report at this point in time, however.

Referring to the third paragraph on page 65, Professor Hultin observed that the proposal would not preclude a qualified leader from a profession other than Medicine from being appointed as Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty. He asked if it could be understood, therefore, that the Dean of the College of Medicine would not automatically be named Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty and that a vacancy would normally be filled through a process of open election or a search. Dr. Keselman said, given the socio-political context of the current health environment, for the foreseeable future the most logical choice for the dual role would be the Dean of the College of Medicine. If the context were to change, this might not be the case.

Referring to Table 1 on page 61, Professor Edwards observed that the membership of the faculty council of the proposed Faculty would include 899 faculty members, in addition to student and staff representatives. She asked if there is a meeting room large enough to accommodate such a large group. Dr. Keselman said it would be unlikely that all of the members would attend any given meeting.

Referring to the final paragraph on page 73, Professor Booth asked which University governing documents would require revision and what types of governing documents would need to be developed if the Faculty were to be established. Dr. Keselman said faculty and college council bylaws would have to be created and existing University governing documents would need to be amended to reflect the new academic structure. Mr. Leclerc offered, as examples, documents concerning procedures for elections of faculty members to Senate from faculty and school councils. In response to a question, Mr. Leclerc said the need to revise University governing documents would impact the entire University in as much as changes to any faculty council bylaws or Senate regulations do.

Professor Kettner asked if there was additional documentation that might be provided to Senate that would either illuminate how the proponents arrived at their position that the most appropriate leadership structure would be to have the Dean of the College of Medicine automatically serve as Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty or describe other possible leadership structures. Dr. Keselman said no other documents would be provided. She indicated that background materials in support of the proposal are provided as hyperlinks and are referenced in footnotes in the proposal.

Professor Kettner sought clarification on the number of deans and their reporting lines to central administration. Dr. Keselman said there would be a Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty who would also be the Dean of the College of Medicine. In addition, the Colleges of Dentistry, Medical

Rehabilitation, Nursing, and Pharmacy would each have a college dean. The college deans would report to the faculty dean who would, in turn, report to the Provost and who would represent the Faculty on Provost's Council.

Professor Kettner asked how the initial appointment of the Dean and Vice-Provost would be resolved, as it appeared that it would be an acting or interim appointment. He asked if new appointments to this position would follow the usual mechanism of posting the position with a call for applications from internal and/or external candidates. Dr. Keselman said the appointment to the position of Dean and Vice-Provost would not be an acting or interim one. She said it is proposed that, in the first instance, the Dean of the College of Medicine, who is currently in the role of Dean of Medicine, would also be Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty of Health Sciences. She indicated that the current proposal would not lead immediately to the revision of governing documents concerning decanal appointments.

The Chair indicated that the time agreed to for questions of clarification had elapsed. He invited debate and discussion of the motion.

Professor Gabbert said the strongest aspect of the proposal is that the creation of the Faculty would give the health sciences units a single voice to government and other external bodies. He said he is impressed by claims it would lead to more collaborative work and inter-professional development, but questioned whether a new structure is required to achieve these given evidence in the proposal that inter-professional collaborations are already occurring. Professor Gabbert said he had moved the motion at SPPC recommending the proposal to Senate on the basis of the academic merit and resource requirements of the proposal, but he and the seconder had been clear regarding their concerns about the proposed governance structure for the Faculty. He contended that the proposed structure would undermine collegial governance, as the faculty council would be too large to be viable and would give the Council of Deans and Senior Administrative Council, whose membership would be appointed, significant influence in the process. He acknowledged the proponents have shown interest in the idea of developing an elected faculty executive but said he would like to see the details of a proposal for such a body. Professor Gabbert said there would be an impact on the development of promotion and tenure criteria and weightings. He noted that, in the current situation, it is the Faculty Council of Pharmacy that advises the dean about promotion and tenure weightings and criteria for academic staff in Pharmacy.

Professor Gabbert said the proposal provided to Senate, dated August 2013, is not the same proposal that had been received by the SPPC in April 2013. He said the drafters had not provided the information on governance and resources set out on pages 61 – 64 before it had been requested by the SPPC, which had determined that more details on the relationship between the faculty and college councils was required. Professor Gabbert raised a concern that the faculty councils of the

affected units had not voted on the proposal before Senate, which, he maintained, is clearer than the April 2013 document. He suggested that it would be premature for Senate to vote on the proposal without knowing the opinion of faculty in the units most affected by the proposal.

Professor Gilchrist reported that the Dentistry Faculty Council had agreed the proposal would have advantages for Dentistry including resource sharing, leveraging support, and enhancing inter-professional synergies. He suggested, however, that the proposal does not reflect how the proposal was rolled out or received. He challenged the assertion there had been broad consultation. He said most faculty had not been asked for their input, only broad-brush strokes of what would happen had been provided, neither the reports and recommendations from thematic working groups nor information concerning lessons learned from health sciences amalgamations elsewhere had been provided, and neither additional details nor answers to questions concerning governance and jurisdiction had been provided at the town hall.

Professor Gilchrist asserted that the proposal before Senate is substantially different from the document the Dentistry Faculty Council had voted to support conditionally in the spring having been expanded to include important data to support the rationale and specific language on governance, administrative, and jurisdictional structures. He suggested that it would be a misrepresentation to say that the Dentistry Faculty Council had voted to support this proposal. Professor Gilchrist informed Senate that the Dentistry Faculty Council had voted to endorse, in principle, the original proposal, with the following provisions: (i) that the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty of Health Sciences not concurrently hold the position of dean of one of its constituent colleges and (ii) that the resources required for the delivery of the clinical services component of the educational enterprise for the Faculty of Dentistry is funded similarly across all the health sciences. The first speaks to concerns regarding the potential for conflict of interest in the decanal structure. It also relates to a concern regarding the lack of authority and autonomy colleges would have over matters of human and financial resources. Professor Gilchrist observed that the Faculty would control all human and resource allocations, and the Dean and Vice-Provost would have authority over promotion and tenure, hiring, leaves, and performance reviews, with duties only delegated to college deans. College councils would have responsibility and accountability for academic programs but no authority to respond to the needs of the programs. This would potentially place small colleges in position of relative weakness, with respect to a larger college whose dean would exercise authority over the entire Faculty. Professor Gilchrist said different models exist in health sciences faculties at other institutions, including at the University of Western Ontario, where power is more decentralized and constituent schools retain authority over their own jurisdictions and budgets.

The second provision speaks to the perceived importance of being judged on a level playing field for program funding. Professor Gilchrist said the proposal highlights that Dentistry has the highest program cost per

student but ignores two facts; that tuition for the program is among the lowest for dental programs at Canadian universities and that Dentistry has traditionally funded its clinical programs from its budget allocation whereas Medicine and Nursing receive substantial clinical support from Manitoba Health. The singling out of the cost of the Dentistry program is worrying for faculty in Dentistry, as it intimates that substantial trimming of program costs is perhaps being considered. Without equality in program funding, it would be imperative to consider how disparity of program priorities in the constituent colleges would be recognized within the proposed administrative platform structure of the Faculty.

Professor Gilchrist commented on the omission of any collective vision of student experience in the proposal.

Professor Gilchrist suggested that, because the faculty and school councils of the affected units had not had an opportunity discuss key elements of the revised proposal, Senate should return the proposal to those bodies so they might discuss it more fully.

Professor Burczynski said he would echo concerns identified by the previous speakers. He said faculty and students in the Faculty of Pharmacy had not seen the proposal under consideration, which has more depth and material than the proposal discussed by the Faculty Council of Pharmacy. He said the Faculty of Pharmacy is small but it is among the best in Canada. Given resources would be required to offer a planned Entry-to-Practice Doctor of Pharmacy program, which is required for accreditation, he said the matter of resource allocation is important for Pharmacy. He expressed scepticism that forming a Faculty of Health Sciences would spontaneously lead to increased collaborations and collegiality. He said collaborations arise from overlapping interests and the need to draw on certain skills of other researchers. Professor Burczynski expressed concern that objectives for collaborative teaching and shared services would be undermined if Nursing did not relocate to the Bannatyne Campus. He said the proposal should not be approved but should be returned to faculty and school councils of the affected units so they might consider the August 2013 proposal. He proposed that secret ballot votes should be conducted so members might vote in a way they believe would move the University and students forward.

Professor Blunden reiterated concerns about the dual role for the Dean of the College of Medicine. He observed that deans of the colleges would advocate on behalf of their unit and make submissions to the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty, who would have responsibility for allocating resources, planning, and human resources issues. He predicted that the proposed structure would be problematic, as the Dean of the College of Medicine would forward submissions to himself/herself and be expected to judge that submission against those from other colleges. Given the intention that the Dean of the College of Medicine would always hold this dual role, as the medical profession is considered by the proponents to be a prominent player in the healthcare environment (page 65), Professor Blunden suggested the proposed administrative structure would be

dangerous for other colleges and their own particular outlooks as it would place them in a subservient position in relation to the College of Medicine. Dean O'Connell said the proposal is about a vision for health work force development, research, and practice. It is a future that is a reality elsewhere in Canada and worldwide. Dean O'Connell said it is important that Senate approve the proposal for a Faculty of Health Sciences. She acknowledged there are unknowns and details to be worked out. She expressed confidence that the units involved would work collaboratively to resolve these issues. Dean O'Connell said she had spoken with many nurses in the province who indicated that the proposal is the right direction for Nursing, to be side by side with other professions in the healthcare workforce. She said Nursing would benefit enormously in all aspects of its core business. Faculty would benefit from enhanced research collaborations and students would benefit from an inter-professional education and from the enhanced reputation of a combined faculty of health sciences where faculty and students from various disciplines work and study together. Dean O'Connell remarked that it is the structure that would support the sustainability of the Faculty. The success of the proposal is not and cannot be dependent on any one individual. Speaking from her experience of participating in a similar restructuring elsewhere, where Nursing rose to prominence, Dean O'Connell said significant political and financial gains could be achieved when colleagues work together in sustainable ways. She maintained that the vote on the proposal is not a vote for here and now but a vote for the future in the health sciences.

Professor MacPherson acknowledged there are benefits that would arise from the establishment of the Faculty but identified several concerns, including the possibility that the amalgamation of professional faculties might negatively impact fundraising, which would serve to counter other efficiencies that might be achieved. He expressed concern that donors, who wish to support a particular profession, would be less likely to make a gift if there was a possibility that a person from a different profession, who had other interests to balance, would administer the gift. With respect to the argument for the benefits of a unified voice to government, Professor MacPherson suggested that that voice might be fractured where disagreements on a particular issue among governing bodies, for example, the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the College of Registered Nurses of Manitoba, required that certain college deans take different positions. Professor MacPherson also identified the potential for conflict of interest that would be created by the dual role for the Dean of the College of Medicine as a concern. He suggested that it would raise a number of issues from the perspective of administrative law that were not minor issues to be resolved later. He cautioned against stepping forward and then backward as a consequence of a mistake, as it could have drastic consequences for the University in terms of public image.

Professor Kettner said the proposal has the potential to be great in many ways. He expressed concern that, if the process for developing the proposal is not seen to be one that happened in a transparent, accountable, and analytic way, it might jeopardize the development of

future proposals for clusters that might be advanced as part of the ASI. He suggested that there is not a sufficient level of comfort through the University community with the process that has taken place.

Professor Kettner expressed several concerns regarding the dual role for the Dean of the College of Medicine. He echoed others' remarks regarding the potential for a conflict of interest adding that even the perception of unfairness would undermine the objectives of collegial, egalitarian, and collaborative relationships. He challenged the justification that, because the medical profession is a prominent player in the health care environment, the Dean of the College of Medicine would also serve as the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty, as it implies that other health sciences professions are not prominent players. He was also concerned that the Dean of the Faculty would not be appointed through the usual competitive selection process. Professor Kettner said it was important to be clear that the discussion of the dual role for the Dean of the College of Medicine does not reflect either his personal opinions regarding the qualifications or character of the incumbent Dean of Medicine.

Professor Kettner recalled that there had been some discussion of incorporating the Faculty of Human Ecology in the Faculty of Health Sciences. He said there had been enthusiasm regarding the possibility of establishing another low-cost college that would draw on the strengths of other colleges in the areas of population and public health. He advocated that consideration should be given to this possibility yet, as it would tie together the new paradigm of preventive collaborative health and would position the University to be a leader in this area in Canada and internationally.

Mr. Courtemanche said he was not inherently opposed to the proposal but he expressed scepticism that resources allocated to the proposed Faculty would be equitably divided amongst the constituent colleges given the relatively larger size of Medicine, which would undermine the objective for more effective use of resources. Given there is no immediate plan for Nursing to move to the Bannatyne Campus, he asked if efficiencies that might arise from a more integrated infrastructure would be fully realized. He asked if approving the proposal might be premature.

Mr. Kearsey said he has met with hundreds of the University's constituents, including alumni, donors, and government and other partners, who have unanimously expressed their support of an academic structure that reflects similar structures elsewhere that they are familiar with. He said approval of the Faculty of Health Sciences would present significant opportunities for the University in terms of donor relations. He indicated, based on his experiences with alumni and other donors at other research-intensive universities with amalgamated health sciences faculties, it is possible to raise multi-million dollar gifts to support health care generally, as people see an opportunity to have an impact on health. Mr. Kearsey said the University is working in a changing environment and the proposal represents an opportunity to move the institution forward.

He concurred with Dean O'Connell that there are details to be determined. He said it is not possible to have courage and comfort at the same time and sometimes it is necessary to be a bit uncomfortable and to trust in leadership in order to move a proposal forward. He urged Senate to approve the proposal as a way to move the University forward with a unified voice as an institution in front of the community that is watching and is supportive of the proposal.

Dr. Glavin commented on the potential to enhance the research enterprise by establishing the proposed Faculty. He said the CIHR, which funds the majority of health research at the University, has made significant changes to the architecture of funding programs. It will dedicate 45 percent of its budget to Foundation Scheme grants, which require that multi-disciplinary approaches be brought to bear on a particular problem. The CIHR envisions that about 114 grants, valued at \$50,000 to \$1.5 million per year for five or seven years, will be awarded. Dr. Glavin said the University must be in a position to take maximal advantage of this opportunity. Dr. Glavin suggested that increased research collaboration would also enhance the student experience, a priority of the University. He said presentations from Alberta Innovates and the Fonds de recherche du Québec, at a recent meeting led by the Manitoba Health Research Council, showed that students benefit when multiple perspectives are brought to focus on a problem because they receive a variety of perspectives on a problem. Dr. Jayas said that Genome Canada also relies on institutions to bring researchers together to develop proposals for large-scale multi-disciplinary proposals.

Professor Chen suggested that Senate had not been provided with sufficient information to make an informed decision on the proposal, as evidence is lacking for many questions. She proposed that more information might be provided on the specific advantages that would arise in terms of improving the student experience through interdisciplinary work, suggesting that it should be more than the addition of three or six credit hours of coursework from another program. Professor Chen said that, because collegial governance is fundamental to research, teaching, innovation, and interdisciplinary collaboration, it is important that concerns regarding the dual role of the Dean of the College of Medicine be addressed. In particular, she identified the need for the development of an appropriate selection process that would take into account the views of members of other colleges and not just the views of members of the College of Medicine. She acknowledged that the current Dean of the Faculty of Medicine is qualified for the position, but said it would be important to see that the amalgamation could succeed over the long term.

Responding to a concern that the amalgamation might have negative consequences for the accreditation status of programs, Dean Mulvale said, on the basis of his experience in Social Work and with the Canadian Association for Social Work Education, accrediting bodies are concerned that there is a distinct unit that oversees program and curriculum development. They would not be concerned with whether that unit is a free-standing faculty or a department or school within a larger faculty.

Dean Mulvale said that, in the human services fields including Social Work, there is an increasing trend toward inter-professional education, trans-disciplinary collaborations, and community based approaches that rely on clinics and community based models. He said that, in some ways, academe is catching up to best practices in the human services field. Professor McMillan indicated that she is supportive of the proposal overall. She remarked that health care is a significant mandate of the government and is of interest to many members of the community. She said collaboration amongst health care professions is vital to address the health needs of the community. She observed that, not only is Medicine prominent, but there is increasing recognition that there are many prominent partners in the health professions, including Nursing. She noted that, within the proposed Faculty structure, Nursing would have the largest number of undergraduate students. Given this, she said it would be important for the University to think about how to mount a persuasive collegial collaboration. Professor McMillan said, with respect to the University priority for delivering an exceptional student experience, that, inter-professional education is a growing component of health care education. Noting that the basis of the approach includes equality, respect, collaboration, and collegiality, she said it would be important to consider establishing a structure for the proposed Faculty that would be clear, fair, respectful, and equal in all aspects, in order to deliver an exceptional student experience that models collegiality. She spoke against establishing a structure that would not make it possible for a subsequent Dean and Vice-Provost to be selected from any one of the disciplines represented by the constituent colleges.

In response to Professor Gabbert's remarks regarding collegial governance, Dr. Keselman said that the proponents have indicated they would consider establishing a faculty executive council, which was suggested by Senate Executive. With respect to his comments on promotion and tenure, Dr. Keselman said the proponents had been careful, in developing the proposal and commenting on promotion and tenure, to be respectful of the current UMFA Collective Agreement, which assigns particular responsibilities to the faculty council and the dean of a faculty versus a college council or dean of a college. She suggested there are examples in the Faculty of Arts where differences between disciplines are more marked than they are between the health sciences disciplines; for example, between archaeology and behavioural neuroscience. She reasoned that it should, therefore, be possible to establish promotion and tenure criteria for the Faculty.

With respect to members' concerns regarding the dual role for the Dean of the College of Medicine as Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty, Dr. Keselman noted that she had already commented on rationales for the proposed structure. She said the proposed structure exists at every postsecondary institution in Canada where Medicine is part of a larger structure. She reported based on her conversations with people at those other institutions that the proposed structure appears to work. She acknowledged that it does depend on the extent to which the people in place are willing to collaborate. She said, if a decision were taken to

move in this direction, it would mean that people are making a commitment to participate in the type of collaborative leadership that would be required to move the initiative forward. In response to members' observations that it would be premature to vote on the proposal because it contains new information, Dr. Keselman said the August 2013 document differs from the April 2013 document in two aspects. It includes facts about the resources at hand, which were included so the SPPC could make a decision as to whether there are sufficient resources to undertake this transition. Dr. Keselman underscored that information that had been added concerning the governance structure represents only envisioned responsibilities for the deans of the colleges and the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty from the perspective of the proponents. She indicated that the envisioned responsibilities set out on page 62 do not represent an exhaustive list of responsibilities. She reiterated that these responsibilities would be detailed as part of the development of the faculty and college council bylaws, by the faculty members and people who would be part of the Faculty, and that the bylaws would be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures for recommendation to Senate. Dr. Keselman said there would no point in referring the proposal back to the faculties, as the detailed work would not be done before there is an indication from Senate that it supports the concept.

The Chair noted that the 90 minutes allotted for discussion of the proposal would elapse shortly and that thirteen Senators had indicated their intent to speak. He asked members how they wished to proceed.

**Professor Kettner MOVED, seconded by Professor McMillan, THAT debate of item X(2)(b) a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences be extended to allow Senate to hear from thirteen additional members.**

**CARRIED**

Mr. Kochan said that, from an administrative point of view and considering the strong prospect of future reductions in provincial and federal government funding, the proposal for an integrated Faculty of Health Sciences is important because it would lead to integrated and coordinated administrative functions that would reduce duplication of effort and make better use of existing resources. Other expected benefits include fully integrated financial plans, operating budgets, and capital budgets, a single unified voice to various funding agencies, and integrated campus facility planning for the Bannatyne Campus. Mr. Kochan said integrated services for faculty, students, and staff would improve infrastructure and enhance the student experience. Coordinated and strategic investments would lead to better financial operations and outcomes that would support greater educational possibilities for students that would ultimately lead to better outcomes for patients.

Dr. Brothwell said there are advantages to the proposal from the perspective of education and advancing the reputation and ability of the University. He said the existing system, with separate faculties for each of the health science disciplines, is an out-dated model that no longer fits

with current practices in health care, and particularly dental health care. He suggested that Dentistry, which has always functioned in a separate but parallel system, is uniquely positioned to benefit from the proposed restructuring. He said it has become challenging for researchers in the Faculty of Dentistry to access funds under the new model for funding. He reported that the Faculty had already experienced the benefits of participating in an integrated model when it recently approached the province, as a partner with the Faculty of Medicine, and received \$500,000 to establish an International Centre for Oral Systemic Health to lead research and education on the relationship between oral health and overall health. The Faculty of Dentistry had not been successful when it had approached the province on its own with a request for support for the same initiative several years earlier.

Dr. Brothwell contended that the successful application to the province for funds demonstrates the advantages of the cluster model and the proposed dual role for the Dean of the College of Medicine for the benefit of education and research. He said the deans of the proposed colleges are all supportive of this structure and would be responsible for ensuring that it would work. He pointed out that dual role would be analogous to roles for the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, who also represents the School of Medical Rehabilitation, and the Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, who represents the School of Dental Hygiene.

Responding to Professor Gilchrist's comments regarding the need for equivalent funding across all programs, Dr. Brothwell suggested that the University already does this as it funds various programs within the paradigm they work in. He said the Faculty of Dentistry's clinic operates in a fee-for-service environment, which is the same environment in which dental practitioners work.

It was noted that the wording of the motion on the floor differed from the recommendation in the Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee on page 53 of the agenda. Professor Prentice suggested that, to be clear about which version of the proposal (original or revised) Senate was being asked to approve, the wording of the motion should be the same as the recommendation.

The mover and seconder agreed to the friendly amendment and the motion was revised as follows:

**THAT Senate approve in principle and recommend to the Board of Governors that it approve the establishment of a Faculty of Health Sciences [as outlined in the proposal dated April, 2013 and as revised in August, 2013].**

Professor Prentice suggested that the process for reviewing the proposal sets two poor precedents for future amalgamations that might take place as part of the ASI. One is that adequate consultation may not have occurred, given that some faculty in the units affected have indicated they did not see the final version of the proposal. The second is the

presumption that the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty would always be the Dean of the College of Medicine, which suggests that the various other colleges would be secondary to the College of Medicine. Professor Prentice suggested that this would be a poor model of amalgamation and one that would not be compelling to faculty in other units that might be involved in future amalgamations.

Professors Prentice and Alward contended that the proposal should be referred back to the affected units to allow faculty members an opportunity to consider the August 2013 version of the proposal. Professor Alward said she could not support the motion if colleagues in the Faculties of Dentistry and Pharmacy had not seen, voted on, and supported the proposal before Senate. She said she would require some assurances that stakeholders had input into what would be their future.

Referring to concerns regarding the dual role for the Dean of the College of Medicine, Professor Lobdell suggested that Deans of the Faculties of Arts and Sciences, who have a home department but must represent the Faculty as a whole, have managed similar circumstances over many years without trouble. Referring to observation 8 in the Report of the SPPC, which indicates that issues concerning administrative and governance structures must be resolved by the academic units involved, Professor Lobdell observed that diligence is required everywhere and always to see that governance issues are properly and fairly addressed with careful thought. Referring members to observation 14 of the same report, he reasoned that Senate should take note of the time and effort invested in the SPPC's review of the proposal, which resulted in a better proposal, and trust that body's view that the proposal to establish the Faculty should be approved in principle based on its academic merit.

Dean Halden said the proposal represents an exciting new future for the health sciences. He said, because the creation of the Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources has added to student experience, collaboration, and research, he is confident that these expected outcomes for the proposed Faculty of Health Sciences would be realized. He said the development of an appropriate governance structure is not an instantaneous process but an opportunity for people in the Faculty to sit down together and determine their future. He expressed confidence that the deans of the colleges working together with the Dean and Vice-Provost of the Faculty would do this. Dean Halden reiterated that Senate's discussion of the proposal is just the first conversation it would have regarding the development of this idea and that Senate must take the first step of approving the proposal so the proponents might be charged with developing and returning to Senate with faculty and college council bylaws that describe an appropriate governance structure for the Faculty.

Dr. Jayas also spoke to the potential benefits a more integrated structure would have for the research enterprise. He said an integrated structure would facilitate the delivery of services and support that the Office of the Vice-President (Research and International) provides to the research

community. A more integrated structure and the development of a research platform that would be widely used, well maintained, and provide technical support, versus having instrumentation that is widely distributed and in use only part of the time, would make it possible for the Faculty to make more effective use of costly infrastructure and instrumentation required for health research. Dr. Jayas said that, from the point of view of undergraduate and graduate student research training, students would benefit not by having opportunities to complete elective courses in other programs but by having opportunities to consider issues and problems from the different lenses of the various disciplines as part of an inter-disciplinary team of researchers.

Professor Menkis recalled that, when he was recruited to the University several years ago to develop a heart program for Winnipeg and the province, he had been struck by the extent to which the health system was fragmented, with conflicting priorities and divided loyalties. He suggested this circumstance was the end result of what the health sciences faculties are currently trying to do academically and runs counter to the objective we share to educate good researchers and clinicians. He contended that the barriers that inhibit collegiality and collaboration must be broken down. Professor Menkis said much of the Medicine curriculum, which has been renewed in the last few years, now relates to how health professionals work in an inter-professional way and reflects the way in which problems are dealt with in the day-to-day practice of health care. He said the creation of an integrated Faculty of Health Sciences would be one way to move toward teaching and research in an inter-professional way because it would bring people from the various health disciplines together. He agreed that it would also benefit the research enterprise, as independent researchers who approach funders do not get the same hearing as research teams that can approach problems from various perspectives. He pointed to Dr. Brothwell's remarks, regarding the successful application to the province for funds for the International Centre for Oral Systemic Health and added that periodontal disease is not only about oral health but is about cardiac disease, and cancer, and systemic and infectious disease. He concurred with the Provost and others that, at some point it is necessary to take the first step. Attempting to solve every possible eventuality prior to establishing the Faculty would result in a standstill which, he contended, is a real danger. He said there is a window of opportunity and, if the University fails to act, harm would potentially be caused not just to teaching and research but to the entire province.

Responding to a concern that establishing an integrated Faculty would discourage donations from alumni, Professor Menkis said the University would be obligated to respect the wishes of a donor who might direct their gift to a particular discipline, whether it is Pharmacy or Dentistry or Medicine.

Professor Hultin said it is clear that a Faculty of Health Sciences should be established but he said he could not vote in favour of a proposal that would entail the automatic and concurrent appointment of any dean as a

vice-provost. He contended that no faculty dean should out-rank other faculty deans at the University and that all faculty deans should approach the Provost as peers. He expressed concern regarding the disparity of a proposal that calls for the dean of a major academic unit, that would command a significant portion of the University's total budget, and who would be chosen from the ranks of one college, would, in effect, hold an ex officio appointment as vice-provost. Professor Hultin asked Senate to consider amending the motion to allow for a vote on the establishment a Faculty of Health Sciences, with the units identified in the proposal, but without endorsing a particular vision.

Dean Whitmore confirmed that as Dean of the Faculty of Science and as a member of a department within that Faculty it is necessary to balance the two roles. He recalled that, when the Department of Biological Sciences had been established by the amalgamation of the Departments of Botany and Zoology, there had also been considerable discussion of restructuring. A decision had been made to make a structural change on the basis that integration would create benefits in terms of undergraduate and graduate curriculum renewals and opportunities to work together and to undertake hiring as a new group of people thinking about and doing things in new ways. Discussion of several unanticipated opportunities also benefited from the perspective of a new group of people including opportunities to occupy the Biological Sciences Building and to restructure the Duff Roblin Building.

Dr. Collins said he would echo Professor Menkis's comments. In response to concerns expressed regarding accreditation standards, he noted that, in the case of Pharmacy, Medicine, and Nursing, interdisciplinary education is a requirement of the accrediting bodies. He said the current structure presents some impediments to meeting this requirement. He added that the objective of Pharmacy's accrediting body is for pharmacists to take a more clinical role. There is also greater concern with developing strong teams of support around patient care and providing students with opportunities for interdisciplinary learning. Dr. Collins noted that these things are beginning to occur, for example, through combined student clinics, but further development would be facilitated by the establishment of the integrated Faculty.

Addressing an earlier remark, Dean Davies said Pharmacy would not be subservient to Medicine in the proposed Faculty and he indicated his intention to continue to speak to the concerns of his constituents, as he had done during discussions that had occurred over the previous two years. He acknowledged that some members of Senate and of the Faculty of Pharmacy have concerns about the proposal. In his leadership position, however, he contended he must support the proposal to establish the integrated Faculty because it is an important step that must be taken to bring about changes in health care in order to address areas where the system is currently failing society including in Aboriginal communities and health, childhood obesity, diabetes, and health issues related to smoking, which would require the combined efforts of the various health care disciplines.

Professor Etcheverry said the School of Medical Rehabilitation had been established fifty years ago by a number of visionary therapists and physicians who had understood that health was more than the absence of disease and who had recognized the need to also be concerned about quality of life and the experiences of people suffering disability. She remarked that, since the School's inception, the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine has had the dual role in relation to the School. She said that this structure had not limited the School. She observed that growth of the School, in terms of the number of students and programs, had, in fact, put it in a position to assume the status of a college within the proposed Faculty. She noted that the Dean of Medicine is fully supportive of this aspect of the proposal. Professor Etcheverry suggested that this should dispel concerns about whether the various disciplines can co-exist in a collaborative way with their different ideas about and ways of contributing to healthcare. Professor Etcheverry reported that faculty in the School of Medical Rehabilitation are looking forward to opportunities for collaborations that might be fostered through this initiative. She remarked that structure dictates how people interact. She said that during discussions that led to the proposal, people had opportunities to participate in different types of interactions among the health disciplines than have occurred previously. Professor Etcheverry said there is momentum to move the proposal forward including leadership who are interested in seeing the initiative through. She urged Senate not to lose the opportunity to move the proposal forward in a positive way.

The Chair indicated that three more members had indicated their intent to speak. He said the committee might close the debate at this point or extend it to accommodate those members.

**Dean Whitmore MOVED THAT debate of item X(2)(b) a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences be extended to allow Senate to hear from three additional members.**

**CARRIED**

Dean Benarroch said he had participated in a similar amalgamation process to create a new faculty at another institution. He recalled that many of the same arguments had been made about differences in size, the balance of power, bias, and that small units would be weaker. He reported that, in the end, the opposite was found to be true and that, in fact, everyone had been strengthened by bringing together units with shared interests. Dean Benarroch said the province of Manitoba lags behind other jurisdictions where integrated health care is the reality in today's academic world. He said the University should be leading rather than following. He contended that through its establishment of the proposed Faculty it would communicate that it is moving forward. It would also signal that its graduates have graduated from a program where doctors, pharmacists, dentists, and nurses are viewed as more equal. He echoed others' comments that the decision to create the Faculty would require a leap of faith. Dean Benarroch said based on the very collaborative process that has led to an excellent proposal, he has full confidence that the necessary work would be done and that the units

involved in the proposal would be strengthened. He said there is nothing in the proposal that suggests the intent is to weaken any of the units involved, particularly because the University has a mandate to train people to work in the various areas of health care.

Professor Ouelette said he supports the proposal in principle. Referring to the expected outcomes listed on page 75 and to the expectation that the proposal would result in accelerated progress on recruitment and retention of Indigenous students, he asked that the units involved in the proposal consider taking a further step to also consider different ways of providing health care, including incorporating holistic concepts of healing and Indigenous knowledge of healing.

Professor Kettner proposed that the motion be amended to specify that the process to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences be continued, without reference to the August 2013 proposal, in order to: require that the proponents to provide Senate with a clear and substantive response to all of the questions raised at the meeting, including the delineation of a detailed process to ensure the whole University has an opportunity to see and engage in a discussion of the proposal; consider the possibility of including the Faculty of Human Ecology and other faculties in the proposal; consider the possibility of establishing a college of Population and Public Health within the proposed Faculty, to address the new paradigm of prevention and collegiality around prevention; determine where a Nursing building might be located.

**Professor Kettner MOVED THAT Senate approve the continuation of a process to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences.**

Dr. Keselman spoke strongly against the amendment to the motion. She said the proposal represents two years of work by the proponents to establish a blueprint to move forward with establishing a Faculty of Health Sciences; one that includes sufficient detail, offers rationale and context, and outlines the expected benefits of the proposed Faculty. She said the Report of the SPPC clearly states that administrative and governance structures need to be developed further and she emphasized that this work must be done by the academic units involved in the proposal and not by the proponents of the proposal alone (observation 8). She said the details being requested could not be developed before the Faculty is formally established and faculty and college council bylaws are developed. She reiterated that these documents would be brought to Senate for its consideration and approval. Dr. Keselman stressed that approval in principle is required to advance the proposal, so it is possible to engage academic members of the proposed Faculty in further development of the Faculty.

Professor Hultin agreed that continuing the process is not what is required and urged Senate not to approve the amendment to the motion. He proposed that the motion be divided into two parts; one on the desirability of establishing a Faculty of Health Sciences and one concerning the suitability of the particular proposal before Senate.

Professor MacPherson said the amendment to the motion does not address a primary concern identified at the meeting, the question of whether or not the proposal voted on by the affected faculties and schools is the same proposal before Senate.

Professor Kettner withdrew the amendment to the motion.

Professor Gabbert concurred with Professor MacPherson that the fundamental concern with the proposal is that the faculty and school councils of the affected units should have an opportunity to give their opinion on the August 2013 version of the proposal, which he maintained is more transparent than the April 2013 proposal considered by the councils. He contended that members of the councils should be able to vote by secret ballot on the revised proposal, to give Senate a clear view of whether or not they support the proposal. He said Senate should not vote on a motion where the view of the members of the affected faculty councils is not clear.

**Professor Gabbert MOVED, seconded by Professor Kettner, THAT the proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences [as outlined in the proposal dated April, 2013 and as revised in August, 2013] be referred back to Senate Executive, to be brought back to Senate at the next meeting having arranged for proper consultation with the affected faculty councils in the form of a secret ballot vote, the results which would be reported at that time.**

The Chair suggested that the utility of returning the proposal to that body is not clear given it had already taken its decision to endorse the document to Senate. Professor Gabbert said that, subsequent to the September 18<sup>th</sup> Senate Executive meeting, members of the affected units had raised the concern that they had not been provided with the revised document until September 23<sup>rd</sup>. He reasoned, therefore, that what Senate Executive had heard about faculty and school councils' views on the earlier proposal is not relevant.

Mr. Leclerc provided Senate with background information on the process that was followed at the time that the Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources was established. He recalled that two different proposals had been brought forward for consideration and the SPPC had created a third proposal, none of which had been voted on by affected units. The three proposals had been provided to Senate for discussion and a decision. Mr. Leclerc reminded members that under the University of Manitoba Act it is in the authority of Senate to make recommendations to the Board on such matters.

Professor Gabbert suggested that bad past practice does not justify current bad practice. He remarked that, in the context of the Academic Structure Initiative, it needs to be clear that the people who ultimately would be affected by a proposal for a new structure would need to see the proposal in its ultimate form before Senate made a decision on the proposal.

Dr. Keselman spoke strongly against the motion. She reiterated that the differences between the two proposals are not substantive. Additional information on resources requirements are simply facts provided so SPPC could consider the resource implications of the proposal. Additional information concerning proposed administrative and governance structures are simply the proponents views, with some examples, on what they envision the respective responsibilities of the faculty and college councils might be and not what they would be. Dr. Keselman stressed that the people in the affected units must determine these things.

Professor Etcheverry suggested that sufficient consultation on the revised proposal had occurred. She noted that it had been sent out to members of the affected units and the broader community with opportunities for individuals to comment on the proposal. She said the School of Medical Rehabilitation Council had discussed the revised proposal at its meeting on October 1<sup>st</sup>. The Council had not voted on the document, as it did not view it as a change to the proposal.

Professor Hultin urged Professor Gabbert to withdraw the motion to refer the proposal back to Senate Executive. He reiterated his view that the motion should be divided into two parts.

Mr. Thapa expressed a concern that, given the length of the meeting, student Senators had begun to leave the meeting before students' views had been heard. He informed Senate that the Student Senate Caucus had considered the proposal on the previous day. He noted quorum had not been met but said the committee had indicated its support, in principle.

Professor Funk challenged assertions that proper consultation had not occurred saying that faculty been inundated with information from deans, via blogs and other social media, and at town hall meetings.

**Professor Funk MOVED to call the question on Professor Gabbert's motion to refer the proposal back to Senate Executive.**

**CARRIED**

Professor Gabbert's motion was **DEFEATED**

**Mr. Thapa MOVED to close debate and call the question on the main motion, proposed by Dean Postl.**

**CARRIED**

A vote was called on the main motion.

The motion was **CARRIED**

The Chair thanked Senators for participating in the debate and all of those who had been involved in developing the proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences.

XI **REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES OF SENATE,  
FACULTY AND SCHOOL COUNCILS – none**

XII **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

1. **Report of the Implementation Working Group for the  
Cooper Commission Report: Developing *Bona Fide*  
Academic Requirements for Programs Subject to  
External Accreditation**

Page 77

Ms. Usick recalled that, at the last meeting, Senate had received the document Developing *Bona Fide* Academic Requirements for Programs Subject to External Accreditation, for information. Noting that no changes had been made to the document since that meeting, she said the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission was now seeking Senate's approval of the document. Ms. Usick briefly reviewed observations 3 through 6 in the Report.

**Dean Taylor MOVED, seconded by Professor J. Anderson, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission Report concerning Developing Bona Fide Academic Requirements for Programs Subject to External Accreditation, effective upon approval.**

**CARRIED**

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

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees**

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.

XIII **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 27 combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 84, and the Process for Considering the Proposal to Establish a Faculty of Health Sciences at Senate, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on October 2, 2013.