

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
Ms. K. Adams
Prof. S. Alward
Prof. John Anderson
Prof. Judy Anderson
Dean J. Beddoes
Prof. P. Blunden
Prof. T. Booth
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. M. Brabston
Prof. T. Chen
Prof. L. Coar
Prof. E. Comack
Prof. K. Coombs
Dean D. Crooks
M. G. Csepregi
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. R. Desai
Prof. M. Edwards
Prof. B. Elias
Ms. S. Enns
Prof. M. Eskin
Dr. E. Etcheverry
Mr. L. Ford
Dean H. Frankel
Prof. M. Freund
Prof. M. Gabbert
Mr. O. Gagne
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Prof. J. Guard
Ms. J. Guise
Dean N. Halden
Prof. P. Hess
Prof. P. Hultin
Dean T. Iacopino
Ms S. Jasper
Dr. D. Jayas
Mr. A. Kassum
Mr. J. Kearsey
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. W. Kinsner
Ms. J. Krahn
Mr. W. Liang

Prof. J. Linklater
Mr. R. Lucenkiw
Dean R. MacMillan
Mrs. D. McCallum
Prof. B. McIlwraith
Prof. A. McIntosh
Prof. D. McMillan
Mr. R. McQuire
A/Dean C.
Mossman
Prof. S. Palahicky
Prof. S. Pistorius
Prof. T. Podolsky
Prof. K. Polyzois
Prof. M. Pritchard
Mr. A. Reisacher
Dr. I. Ripstein
Mr. L. Sader
Prof. M. Scanlon
Ms. J. Sealey
Dean G.
Sevenhuysen
Prof. L. Strachan
Ms. C. Tapp
Dr. R. Tate
Dean J. Taylor
Dean M. Trevan
Dr. C. Trott
Prof. J. Trottier
Prof. J. Van Rees
Prof. C. Van Winkle
Prof. P. Venkatesh
Dean J. Watkinson
Prof. D. Watt
Ms. M. Wayne
Ms. M. Wetzell
Dr. D. Wirtzfeld
Dean M. Whitmore
Prof. E. Worobec
Prof. K. Wrogemann
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University
Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,
Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

Ms. J. Chen
Dr. D. Collins
Ms. A. Ducas
Dr. K. Matheos
Ms. N. Rashid
Dr. M. Torchia

Regrets

Prof. J. Asadoorian
Prof. B. Bacon
Ms. C. Bone
Rector D. Bracken
Dean N. Davies
Dean J. Doering
Mr. P. Dueck
Prof. J. Embree
Dr. G. Glavin
Ms. S. Gottheil
Dr. K. Grant
A/Dean B. Hann
Prof. R. Hechter
Prof. E. Judd
Mr. P. Karari
Dr. A. Katz
Prof. C. Morrill
Dean B. Postl
Ms. D. Salem
Mr. H. Sector
Prof. L. Simard
Prof. H. Soliman
Dean L. Turnbull
Prof. K. van Ineveld
Prof. A. Young

Absent

Mr. R. Akther
Mr. T. Daodu
Prof. I. Davidson-
Hunt
Prof. M. Enns
Mr. A. Fazaluddin
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. J. Hanesiak
Prof. J. Hughes
Prof. J. Irvine
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Mr. E. Kuz
Ms. C. Laforge
Prof. D. Mann
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. J. Morrill
Prof. J. Ngo
Mr. P. Panchhi
Prof. K. Plaizier
Prof. S. Prentice
Dr. J. Ristock
Prof. W. Simpson
Dr. D. Smith
Dr. L. Smith
Prof. D. Smyth
Dean R. Stern
Prof. M. Vrontakis
Dean L. Wallace

Also Present

Ms J. Graham
Mr. K. Keegan
Ms. M. Matthews
Prof. J. Scanlan
Ms J. Walton

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Kevin Coombs.

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE - none

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 1. | <u>Statement of Intent – Bachelor of Nursing Science</u> | Page 3 |
| 2. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on Awards
Part A [September 26, 2011]</u> | Page 10 |
| 3. | <u>In Memoriam: Dr. Kenneth and Mrs. Dorothy Slentz</u> | Page 12 |

Dr. Macmillan honoured Dr. Kenneth Slentz, a member of the Faculty of Education from 1969 – 1990, and his wife Dorothy. He remarked that Dr. Slentz is very much remembered among those individuals who worked with him.

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Dr. Barnard reported that he had read a statement of apology, on behalf of the University, before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission at a national event held in Halifax on October 27th. He acknowledged the leadership of Dean Frankel and other members of the Faculty of Social Work, where the idea for making a statement of apology arose, and expressed appreciation for the contributions of others who had participated in drafting the document. Prior to making the public statement, he had shared the text with Deans' Council, Provost's Council, and the Senate Executive, for advice. The Board of Governors had also approved the statement.

Dr. Barnard remarked that it was apparent from Commissioner Sinclair's comments that the statement of apology had been received in the way that the University hoped it would be. Referring to significant media coverage and questions that followed, Dr. Barnard said he had tried to convey that making the statement of apology was something that the University understood, from listening to its members, to be important to the community.

V QUESTION PERIOD

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

No questions had been submitted.

**VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 5, 2011**

Professor Desai asked that the minutes of the previous meeting be amended to identify the specific subsections of the University act that she had cited [Sections 34(1)(l), (s), and (v)] during her response to Dr. Barnard's comments, as read by Dr. Keselman, during question period. Mr. Leclerc indicated that the minutes would be so amended.

Referring to the fourth paragraph under Item VIII, on page five, Professor Desai said that, when she had objected to the Chair's ruling that her questions were out of order, she had understood that Dr. Kesleman had advised her to raise any further issues at the next Senate meeting when Dr. Barnard was back in the chair. Dr. Keselman disagreed with Professor Desai's recollection, saying that she had suggested that Professor Desai direct her concerns to the person who made the ruling.

The minutes of October 5th were amended to reflect that Professor Blunden had been in attendance.

Professor McMillan MOVED, seconded by Professor Etcheverry THAT Senate approve the minutes of October 5, 2011, as amended.

CARRIED

VII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Professor Desai recalled that, at the previous meeting, she had objected to the Chair's ruling, as communicated by Dr. Keselman, that her questions regarding the Duff Roblin Professorship were out of order, citing Sections 34(1)(l), (s), and (v) of the University of Manitoba Act. She argued that these sections of the Act suggest that questions she has raised are part of the business of Senate.

The Chair reiterated his position that the questions raised by Professor Desai relate to an individual personnel matter and that they are out of order. He invited Professor Desai to meet with him to discuss how she wishes to proceed from this point.

Professor Guard offered her view that Professor Desai's comments do raise the question of whether the process followed in awarding a professorship at the University is an academic matter and not a personnel matter.

The Chair reminded Senate that he had, on previous occasions, replied to Professor Desai's comments regarding process, both in writing and at Senate. He noted that what was initially a question about process had become a question of interpretation of who said what under different circumstances. He expressed his view that this question, too, had been addressed previously.

Professor Desai acknowledged that the Chair had responded to her initial questions about the process. She noted that she continues to have concerns about whether or not there may have been conflict of interest, in the awarding the Duff Roblin Professorship, of which Senate should be made aware.

Dr. Barnard restated his offer to meet with Professor Desai, who agreed to a meeting.

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

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 13

Professor Coombs reported that the Senate Executive had met on October 19th. The comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they were made.

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

Ms. Ducas reported that the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee is currently reviewing a proposal for the Community Recreation and Active Living Diploma from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management. The proposal will be brought to Senate in due course.

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

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation
RE: Changes to Final Examination Regulations and Academic
Assessment Regulations, Faculty of Science** Page 14

Professor Etcheverry said the Faculty of Science had proposed a change to its final examination regulations, to eliminate a requirement that final exams be more than, or equal to, fifty percent of the course evaluation unless approved by the Head and Associate Dean. The proposed change would give the instructor greater flexibility in determining how evaluations are spread amongst the evaluations in the course.

Professor Etcheverry noted that the Faculty of Science had also proposed a change to its Academic Assessment Regulations to clarify that the failure policy (F-count rule) was intended to apply to Major and Honours programs, as well as the General program.

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding the Faculty of Science [dated September 29, 2011].

CARRIED

2. **Proposal from the Faculty of Graduate Studies
RE: Ph.D. in Nursing** Page 16

Dr. Crooks MOVED, on behalf of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the proposal from the Faculty of Graduate Studies regarding the introduction of a Ph.D. in Nursing.

a) **Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee**

Page 85

Ms. Ducas indicated that the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee supports a proposal to establish a Ph.D. in Nursing. She noted that the University is one of only two research intensive universities in the country that does not have a doctoral program in Nursing. She reviewed expected outcomes of the program, as set out in the proposal, including: the expansion of knowledge, the provision of expertise important to the development of health care policy, retention of nurses with graduate training in the province, and enhanced ability of the Faculty of Nursing to recruit Ph.D.-educated nurses to fill faculty positions.

Ms. Ducas said the Faculty, which has twenty-one graduate faculty, has demonstrated the capacity to offer a Ph.D. program by its participation in the delivery of the Ph.D. in Cancer Control, together with the Department of Community Health Sciences, and through its experience in establishing a Ph.D. in Nursing at the University of Medical Sciences, Havana, Cuba.

Ms. Ducas noted that the Faculty of Nursing has assured the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee that it can fund the Ph.D. program based on existing resources, including support staff, space, technical and library support. The four-year Bachelor of Nursing program at Red River College will be fully implemented by the end of 2014, and the joint University of Manitoba/Red River College BN will be closed. The resulting decrease in undergraduate nursing enrolment at the University will allow the Faculty to allocate additional teaching resources to the doctoral program.

Ms. Ducas observed that the Faculty of Nursing intends to admit six doctoral students every two years, for a maximum of twelve students. The students would have access to University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowships and to research funding from within the Faculty. Research support is also available through the Manitoba Centre for Nursing Health Research.

Ms. Ducas called attention to letters of support from external agencies and institutions that suggest there is both a need and employment opportunities for Ph.D. -trained nurses.

MOTION CARRIED

3. **Proposal from the Senate Committees on Animal Care and the Ethics of Research Involving Human Subjects**
RE: re-structuring of research ethics governance and oversight

Page 87

Dr. Jayas referred members to a proposal to re-structure research ethics governance and oversight of research activities involving animal or human subjects. He explained that Senate would retain the authority to set policy related to animal care and human ethics, but responsibility for the day-to-day oversight of operational activities would be delegated to the Committee on Animal Care and the Human Ethics Resource Committee. Dr. Jayas pointed out that similar structures are in place at thirteen of the fifteen research intensive universities in Canada. The proposed changes have been made in consultation with, and are supported by, the Senate Committee on Animal Care, the Senate

Committee on the Ethics of Research Involving Human Subjects, university staff involved with animal care, and the Office of Research Services.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve a proposal from the Senate Committee on Animal Care and the Ethics of Research Involving Human Subjects regarding re-structuring of research ethics governance and oversight.

Professor Guard asked if the proposed changes are designed to solve a particular problem or to centralize activities that are currently managed at a more local level. Dr. Jayas replied that the responsibility for reviewing human ethics protocols will remain with the five Research Ethics Boards (REBs) that currently review such protocols.

Referring to a proposed revision to item 2.3.3.3 of the policy on The Ethics of Research Involving Humans, Professor Chen asked if the change would require ethics approval where administrative data are to be used for equity systems reviews. She raised a concern that requiring such approval might discourage units from undertaking these types of reviews. Dr. Jayas replied that the chair of the appropriate REB would make a ruling as to whether the data was administrative data or research data. He noted that the revised policy on The Ethics of Research Involving Humans is consistent with the 2010 Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS 2), which dictates that, if data collected involving human subjects are to be interpreted or analysed, for use in a report or publication, they are to be considered research data. In such circumstances, ethics approval is required. If data are collected for administrative purposes, then ethics approval is not required.

Referring to page 87 of the agenda, Dean Taylor asked if Observation 3 is intended to imply that the existing University policies are not in full compliance with the requirements of the Canadian Council for Animal Care (CCAC) and the TCPS 2. Dr. Jayas indicated that both the current and revised policies are consistent with the CCAC and the TCPS 2.

Professor Guard applauded the inclusion of a faculty member who does not use animals in research or teaching among the members of the Committee on Animal Care. She proposed that this person might be someone who is conversant in animal rights or larger concerns about animal treatment, in order to demonstrate that the University is proactive in terms of being concerned about how animals are used on university campuses. Dr. Jayas replied that the proposed composition of the Committee is based on CCAC guidelines, which clearly dictate that one member must be a community representative who does not use animals in research or teaching. He added that all members of the committee are charged with assessing the ethics of using animal for research.

MOTION CARRIED

4. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards
Part B [September 26, 2011]** Page 136

Professor Hultin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the report of the Senate Committee on Awards Part B [dated September 26, 2011] regarding the Donna R. Moore Bursaries in Medicine.

Professor Hultin informed members that the Donna R. Moore Bursaries in Medicine is an existing set of bursaries that were originally targeted at women in the Faculty of Medicine. As women in Medicine have reached an approximate parity with men, human rights legislation requires that any awards targeted at women must be amended. The donor for these bursaries has asked that the award be targeted to Aboriginal women in Medicine, and the Senate Committee on Awards has determined that this is permissible given enrolment statistics presented by the Faculty of Medicine.

CARRIED

5. **Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations** Page 141

Professor Edwards MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated October 5, 2011].

CARRIED

6. **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research
RE: Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes:
Manitoba Centre for Nursing and Health Research** Page 142

Dr. Jayas informed Senate that the Senate Committee on University Research had completed a review of the Manitoba Centre for Nursing and Health Research, as required by the procedure on Research Centres, Institutes, and Groups. Based on that review, the Committee is recommending that the Centre be renewed for a period of five years.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on University Research RE: periodic review of research centres and institutes: Manitoba Centre for Nursing and Health Research.

CARRIED

XII **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS** - none

XIII **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 7, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 145, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on November 2, 2011.