

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
Prof. S. Abeyssekera
Ms. K. Adams
Prof. W. Akinremi
Mr. J. Alho
Prof. S. Alward
Prof. John Anderson
Prof. Judy Anderson
Prof. T. Anna
Prof. J. Asadoorian
Dean C. Axworthy
Dr. M. Ballance
Prof. T. G. Berry
Ms. C. Bone
Prof. M. Brabston
Rector D. Bracken
Prof. M. Campbell
A/Dean D. Clarke
Dean D. Collins
Prof. E. Comack
Prof. R. Cossar
Dr. E. Cowden
Prof. I. Davidson-Hunt
Dean J. Doering
Mr. T. Dueck
Prof. M. Edwards
Prof. J. Embree
Dr. M. Enns
Dean G. Feltham
Dean H. Frankel
Prof. A. Frederiksen
Prof. M. Gabbert
Rectrice R. Gagné
Dr. G. Glavin
Ms. J. Guise
Prof. N. Hansen
Dr. J. Hoskins
Prof. P. Hultin
Ms. K. Hurst
Ms. E. Kim

Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. E. Kuz
Mr. L. Liu
Dr. A. MacDiarmid
Mr. J. McGurran
Dr. R. McIlwraith
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. A. McNicol
Prof. E. Milliken
Dr. D. Morphy
Mr. M. Ostadrahimi
Prof. J. Owens
Ms. M. Pauls
Dean R. Perron
Prof. S. Pistorius
Mr. R. Pudavick
Dr. I. Ripstein
Dr. J. Ristock
Mr. J. Roberts
A/Dean R. Roshko
Dean D. Ruth
Dean D. Sandham
Prof. M. Scanlon
Ms. J. Sealey
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Dean R. Sigurdson
Prof. L. Simard
Prof. W. Simpson
Dr. D. Smith
Prof. T. Sullivan
Dr. R. Tate
Prof. C. Taylor
Prof. J. Trottier
Dr. van Ineveld
Dean L. Wallace
Dean J. Watkinson
Mr. B. Weedmark
Dean J. Wiens
A/Dean K. Wittenberg
Mr. B. Wong
Dr. E. Worobec
Prof. A. Young

Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Ms. M. Brolley,
Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Prof. J. Blatz
Mr. P. Dueck
Dr. K. Grant
Dr. R. Lobdell
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. K. Matheos
Dr. L. Smith
Mr. M. Tripple

Regrets

Mr. D. Bowles
Dr. H. Dean
Dr. E. Etcheverry
Prof. M. Freund
Dean N. Halden
Prof. P. Hess
Dr. D. Jayas
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. L. Kirshenbaum
Prof. K. MacKendrick
Prof. J. Mactavish
Mr. R. Mahé
Ms. K. Marcynuk
Mrs. D. McCallum
Ms. H. Milan
Ms. D. Okrusko
Dr. H. Secter
Prof. J. Van Rees
Dr. D. Wirtzfeld

Absent

Prof. J. Bartlett
Mr. A. Birjandi
Dr. C. Blais
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Ms. N. Chislett
Prof. L. Coar
Prof. K. Coombs
Dr. G. Cronin
Dean E. Dawe
Dean I. Diallo
Prof. Y. Gong
Prof. G. Hatch
Dean A. Iacopino
Prof. J. Irvine
Prof. K. Jensen
Prof. E. Judd
Prof. S. Kirby
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Prof. D. Kuhn
Mr. C. Martel
Prof. C. Morrill
Mr. P. Nawrot
Prof. P. Nickerson
Prof. D. Polyzois
Mr. O. Qureski
Mr. S. Rashid
Ms. N. Sajan
Prof. D. Smyth
Dr. R. Soni
Ms. K. Thompson
Mr. A. Vahedi
Prof. M. Vrontakis
Prof. A. Wright

Also Present

Ms. M. Amyot
Mr. D. Chmielewski
Ms. S. Coyston
Mr. M. Hearson
Ms. S. Petz

Academic Review is expecting minor revisions to the process in the next few months; these changes will be presented to Senate in due course. The second round of graduate program reviews will begin in the fall of 2010.

Dr. Lobdell noted that undergraduate program reviews fall into two categories: for those programs which receive external accreditation, the accreditation report is used as the program review with the Provost adding further points if necessary; the second category is for those programs which do not have an external accreditation. Dr. Lobdell reported that a number of undergraduate program reviews have been completed to date and a number are nearing completion.

**5. Items approved by the Board of Governors
November 17, 2009**

Page 38

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The President reported that Mrs. Elaine Goldie, Vice-President (External), retired in December and expressed his appreciation for the warmth of engagement expressed at her farewell events. Prior to her departure, Mrs. Goldie reported that \$22 million had been raised and that the fundraising was still on track to meet the targets for the end of the fiscal year. Mr. John Alho currently has acting responsibilities for this portfolio.

The President also reported on the retirement of Chancellor Bill Norrie and the election of the new Chancellor Harvey Sexter, who is known to many in the room. He further expressed his appreciation for the warmth of engagement expressed at the farewell events for Dr. Norrie.

V QUESTION PERIOD

No questions were received prior to 10:00 a.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

**VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 2, 2009**

Professor Frederiksen MOVED, seconded by Dean Wiens THAT: the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on December 2, 2009 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

Professor Judy Anderson noted that it would be helpful if the minutes were linked to the pdf of the agenda. The University Secretary agreed to look into this.

VII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES – none

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

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Page 39

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

Professor Blatz reported that a number of programs are currently under review. Four programs are currently with the curriculum sub-committee: PhD in Food Science, PhD in Human Nutritional Sciences, Master of Dentistry in Pediatric Dentistry, and a Bachelor of Arts in Integrated Studies. These proposals will be reported on to Senate in the near future.

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

1. Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on a new *Business-Government Relations* joint Concentration between the MBA and MPA Programs Page 40

Dean Doering reported that the MBA program is composed of 60 credit hours, 48 of which are core courses and 12 credit hours which are electives. The MPA program is composed of 48 credit hours of which 21 credit hours are electives. The joint concentration proposed would seek to merge 12 credit hours of common electives to provide synergies to these programs. This will allow participating students to develop reciprocal understandings of each other's management environments and the critical business-government interface by encouraging inter-program course registration. The concentration would be jointly managed by the two programs.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Dean Feltham THAT: Senate approve the proposal for a *Business-Government Relations* joint Concentration between the MBA and MPA programs.

CARRIED

2. Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on a new Management Accounting Concentration in the MBA program Page 47

Dean Doering reported on the proposal for a Management Accounting concentration to be offered in cooperation with the Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba. Such a program is currently in place in many Ontario universities as well as at UBC and the University of Alberta. Such a proposal will provide marketing and branding benefits to both programs. Dean Doering reported that the primary concern of the Faculty of Graduate Studies was to maintain the standards and autonomy of the MBA program and that the Faculty is confident that this has been addressed.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor Brabston THAT: Senate approve the proposal for a Management Accounting Concentration in the MBA program.

CARRIED

3. **Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation**

a) **Postgraduate Medical Education, Faculty of Medicine:
Evaluation, Remediation and Dismissal Policy** Page 55

Dr. Grant noted that this policy focuses on residents enrolled in postgraduate training programs within the Faculty of Medicine which is not a degree granting program but is the next phase of training for those who have received their MD. This document seeks to ensure procedural fairness and proper feedback to residents during their training.

Dr. Grant MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the Postgraduate Medical Education Policy on Evaluation, Remediation and Dismissal.

CARRIED

b) **Viewing of Final Exams** Page 69

Dr. Grant reported that the Committee is currently reviewing the Exam Regulation Policy which has not been updated for some time. She indicated that the policy was developed at a time when final exams might constitute 50% or more of the final grade. Currently, courses often have more weight placed on term work than in the past. She further indicated that the Committee will continue to review the policy and would report to Senate later in the academic term with further recommendations.

There was a discussion on the Faculty of Science pilot project referred to in the report. Dr. Grant noted that the number of students pre-viewing their exams was very small in relation to the total number of registrations in the Faculty. She further noted that there are other faculties who routinely review final exams with students prior to the appeal deadline as a matter of pedagogical principle. The change proposed here would accommodate the fall 2009 exam period while the Committee continues to review the policy.

Dean Ruth commented that, in the winter 2009 term, of the 59 students who viewed their exam, 51 did not go on to file an appeal. In respect to resources, he suggested that students might be required to view their exams prior to filing an appeal in order to reduce the number of appeals filed. Professor MacMillan suggested that a time frame for students to view their exam might be helpful to avoid students wishing to see their exams at the last minute. Dr. Grant responded that the processes of faculties and the nature of exams differ between faculties and, by not specifying such details, faculties would have the flexibility to develop and employ practices that work in their environment.

Dr. Worobec commented that the Faculty of Science proposed the pilot project due to a recognition that there was a wide variation from department to department in how pre-viewing was conducted and the Faculty went to great lengths to create an equitable, formalized system. She suggested that this item be tabled and the pilot project extended. Dr. Grant responded that adopting this

modification at this time would allow the Faculty of Science to continue their current process.

Professor John Anderson expressed concern about comments in the report on the \$5 fee charged to the students by the Faculty of Science, indicating that the report submitted to SCIE by the Faculty of Science indicated that the fee was a requirement to allow this project to run as funding was required to cover costs such as photocopying exams and paying personnel to administer the viewing, as necessary. He noted that there was concern about the Faculty being inundated with students in courses required for medicine, pharmacy, etc., wanting to look at their exams due to the highly competitive nature of these disciplines. Dr. Grant noted that, while the data presented was merely a snapshot, only \$540 was generated over the calendar year and questioned the value of this. She further indicated that the discussion at SCIE quickly became a discussion on pedagogy as some faculties do this a matter of routine. She indicated that departments and faculties could develop procedures that work for them and could even specify time requirements.

Professor Brabston noted that, if fewer appeals result, there would be a reduced resource burden that would make up for the fees charged. Professor Berry indicated that, in this pilot project, no fee was charged if the instructor was involved; if, however, a graduate student or office assistant was needed to conduct the pre-viewing, a \$5 fee was charged to the student. The Chair reminded Senate that fees are outside the purview of Senate. Professor Embree noted that it would cost the University more to administer such a fee than the \$5 fee was worth.

Dean Wiens noted that the proposal to allow pre-viewing was pedagogically sound and that, in addition, there were resource advantages to reducing the time spent on appeals. Dean Collins noted that few students took advantage of the opportunity to view their paper and asked how widely information on this opportunity was distributed. Dr. Worobec responded that the option was posted on the Faculty of Science website, information was sent to other faculties with students taking courses in the Faculty, posters were posted within units in the Faculty, and professors were directed to make an announcement to their class or include the information in the course syllabus. Dean Wallace noted that, for online courses, Extended Education continues to work towards a technological solution to allow students to view exam papers.

Professor John Anderson noted that, rather than as a disincentive to view their paper, the \$5 fee was an incentive for the student to show up at the arranged time. He also questioned whether SCIE has jurisdiction to make recommendations on fees. Dr. Grant responded that the Committee's recommendation was for approval of the change to the exam regulation; the observation regarding fees reflected the discussion at the Committee.

Professor Judy Anderson noted that the request to pre-view exams had originally come from students who were facing inconsistencies in viewing their exams between professors with some professors allowing viewing and some not. This

came about as a process to address differences across departments. Dr. Smith further indicated that this issue has been raised for the last 12 years in the Student Advocacy report. Dr. Smith also referred to the default if this proposal was not approved, the current policy which states: *“Informal consultation, provided both instructor and student are available and willing, may take place during the period in which access to the scripts is not required.”*

Dr. Grant MOVED on behalf of the Committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation [dated November 10, 2009] regarding a modification to section 2.6.3 (a) of the Exam Regulations Policy on student access to final examinations.

CARRIED

**4. Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions Page 71
RE: Faculty of Pharmacy**

Dr. Morphy spoke to this proposal to simplify the calculation of the admission GPA for the Faculty of Pharmacy and to revise the use of repeated courses to a single repeat of one core course. He reported that an ad hoc committee reviewed admission criteria over the past couple of years. It was noted that the act of repeating multiple courses inflates the admission GPA and that the inflated admission GPA attained this way does not translate into student success in the program. While the report is silent on the effective date, Dr. Morphy indicated that the proposal is for an effective date of September 2011. Dean Collins reported that this proposal would be a fairer admission process and reduce the admission GPA issues which are becoming more prevalent. Dean Ruth questioned how the admission procedure would work for those students who use the “start afresh” program. Mr. Peter Dueck indicated that admission requirements are determined by the program and approved by Senate; students must submit all of their transcripts to apply to a program so the Faculty would be able to make a determination in such cases.

Dr. Morphy MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions [dated November 24, 2009] regarding the Faculty of Pharmacy and that the effective date be September 2011.

CARRIED

X ADDITIONAL BUSINESS - none

XI ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 7 combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 73 distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on January 6, 2010.

/mb