

**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  
Ms. B. Arte  
Prof. J. Asadoorian  
Dean M. Benarroch  
Prof. T. Booth  
Mr. J. Botha  
Mr. S. Bounket  
Very Rev. R. Bozyk  
Prof. M. Brabston  
Ms. S.-M. Chaillot  
Prof. N. Chow  
Prof. D. Churchill  
Dr. D. Collins  
Dean E. Dawe  
Prof. R. Desai  
Dean J. Doering  
Prof. M. Edwards  
Prof. B. Elias  
Prof. J. Embree  
Prof. M. Eskin  
Prof. A. Farenhorst  
Prof. M. Gabbert  
Rectrice R. Gagné  
Prof. J. Gilchrist  
Ms. S. Gottheil  
Prof. J. Guard  
Mr. R. Hagemeister  
Dean N. Halden  
Prof. T. Ivanco  
Mr. R. Jung  
Mr. J. Kearsey  
Prof. V. Keown  
Dr. J. Keselman  
Prof. J. Kettner  
Mr. B. Kleinsasser  
Mr. P. Kochan  
Mr. E. Kraut

Prof. L. Landrum  
Prof. J. Linklater  
Prof. R. McIlwraith  
Prof. A. McIntosh  
Prof. D. McMillan  
Dean D. Mandzuk  
Prof. D. Mann  
Prof. T. Mondor  
Mr. S. Moreno  
Prof. J. Morrill  
Dean B. O'Connell  
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette  
Prof. J. Owens  
Ms. A. Owuapu  
Prof. K. Plaizier  
Prof. T. Podolsky  
Prof. D. Polyzois  
Dean B. Postl  
Ms. J. Rebizant  
Ms. J. Sealey  
Dean G. Sevenhuysen  
Mr. L. Solomon  
Prof. B. Southern  
Mr. D. Sushko  
Mr. D. Sytnik  
Prof. R. Tate  
Dean J. Taylor  
Prof. C. Trott  
Prof. C. Van Winkle  
Prof. L. Wang  
Dean M. Whitmore  
Prof. K. Wrogemann  
Prof. A. Young  
Mr. J. Leclerc,  
University  
Secretary  
Dr. S. Coyston,  
Recording  
Secretary

**Assessors Present**

Mr. J. Adams  
Ms. J. Black  
Mr. G. Csepregi  
Ms. A. Ducas  
Dean H. Frankel  
Prof. B. Hallman  
Prof. B. Hann  
Dr. G. Glavin  
Mr. C. James  
Prof. T. Kucera  
Mr. N. Marnoch  
Prof. K. Matheos  
Dr. J. Ristock  
  
**Regrets**  
  
Prof. B. Bacon  
Prof. P. Blunden  
Ms. M. Brolley  
Ms. J. Chen  
Prof. A. Chiu  
Dean N. Davies  
Prof. E. Etcheverry  
Mr. S. Fazaluddin  
Ms. M. Gabbs  
Prof. J. Hughes  
Prof. P. Hultin  
Dean A. Iacopino  
Ms. S. Jasper  
Dr. D. Jayas  
Prof. A. Katz  
Prof. W. Kinsner  
Prof. A. MacDonell  
Mr. C. Martin  
Prof. F. Parkinson  
Dr. H. Secter  
Dr. L. Smith  
Prof. H. Unruh  
Dean L. Wallace  
Dean J. Watkinson  
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld  
Ms. D. Young

**Absent**

Prof. M. Araji  
Dean J. Beddoes  
Dr. J. Blatz  
Mr. R. Buchanan  
Mr. I. Cook  
Prof. J. Hanesiak  
Prof. R. Hechter  
Prof. P. Hess  
Prof. J. Irvine  
Prof. E. Judd  
Prof. S. Kouritzin  
Ms. A. Maqsood  
Ms. V. Marriott  
Mr. J. Ngo  
Mr. J. Ossachuk  
Mr. Z. Pan  
Mr. C. Smith  
Prof. D. Smyth  
Prof. H. Soliman  
Dean R. Stern  
Prof. L. Strachan  
Dr. M. Torchia  
Dean M. Trevan  
Dean L. Turnbull  
Prof. P. Venkatesh  
Mr. C. Yap

**Also Present**

Ms. K. Fowler  
Ms. H. Long  
Ms. T. Lussier  
Ms. C. Préjet  
Prof. K. Smith  
Ms. S. Utsunomiya  
Ms. M. Watson

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Dean Brian Postl, Faculty of Medicine.

**AGENDA**

**I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none**

**II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE**

1. **Revision to 2012-2013 Academic Schedule** Page 3
2. **Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes RE: Biomedical Engineering [November 21, 2012]** Page 4

Dean Postl MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve a revision to the 2012-2013 Academic Schedule and the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes concerning Biomedical Engineering [dated November 21, 2012].

**CARRIED**

**III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [November 19, 2012]** Page 5

Mr. Adams reported that the Senate Committee on Awards had approved two new offers, two amended offers, and the withdrawal of seven offers, at its meeting on November 19<sup>th</sup>.

2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review RE: Undergraduate and Graduate Program Reviews** Page 9

Dr. Collins observed that the Report of SCAR addresses six graduate and two undergraduate program reviews, and the status of externally accredited programs. He noted that program review schedules and a listing of accredited programs have been posted on the webpage of the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost.

3. **Items Approved by the Board of Governors, on November 20, 2012** Page 17

**IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

1. **Strategic Enrolment Management Planning Framework Presentation**

The Chair invited Ms. Gottheil, Vice-Provost (Students) and Dean Doering, Vice-Provost (Graduate Education) to make a presentation on the Strategic Enrolment Management Framework.

Dr. Keselman reminded Senators that student enrolment management (SEM) was established as an initiative under the Optimizing Academic Resources (OARs) project, on the basis that a comprehensive strategy for recruiting and retaining students who are the best fit for the institution is necessary if the University is to make the best use of its academic resources. She reminded members that, as part of its commitment to offer an outstanding student experience, the University's strategic planning framework also sets a goal to establish an SEM plan. An SEM Planning Committee, co-chaired by Ms. Gottheil and Dean Doering, and including, among others, representatives of UMSU and the GSA and the Chair of SPPC, has been established. A number of sub-committees have been struck to assist the Committee in its work. Dr. Keselman thanked members of the SEM Planning Committee and the sub-committees for their work.

Dr. Keselman said the Committee has shared and received input on its work at meetings of various faculty and school councils, the Board of Governors (March 20, 2012), and the SPPC (April 30, 2012) and would welcome input from Senators. She and Ms. Gottheil indicated that the Committee will continue to develop the SEM Planning Framework, taking into account the feedback that it receives, with the intention of bringing a formal document to Senate for further consideration.

Ms. Gottheil said SEM relates to various University priorities but particularly to the priority to deliver an exceptional student experience, which can be measured by: (i) attracting students who persist to graduation; (ii) high student satisfaction ratings with respect to courses, programs, instructors, and student services; (iii) students' achievement of learning outcomes; (iv) students' attainment of educational objectives (i.e. further education or employment); and (v) alumni loyalty. She reasoned that planning is essential if the University is to meet its objective. SEM is useful in this regard as a planning framework or tool that can be used to identify and achieve particular goals. Noting that there are many definitions, Ms. Gottheil said SEM is a comprehensive or integrative approach to planning that: is derived from the academic mission of the University; takes into account recruitment, retention, and graduation rates of students; and is embedded in all of an institution's planning, policies, and services.

Observing that the University has never engaged in a conversation about enrolment goals, Ms. Gottheil proposed that it is necessary to be intentional about enrolment planning and to continuously revisit enrolment goals and strategies. She noted that traditional enrolment planning is viewed in terms of recruitment and typically begins with a review of recruitment strategies and tactics. The SEM planning model differs in that it begins with decisions about optimal enrolment targets that are based on a institution's academic mission and goals, with the objective of recruiting the right students for the university. The next step is to develop tactics and strategies to meet those targets. Optimal enrolment might take into account a number of factors including total overall

enrolment, number of undergraduate and graduate students, the quality and diversity of the student body, and capacity management.

Ms. Gottheil and Dean Doering briefly outlined the following five-year enrolment targets (to 2017) under consideration by the SEM Planning Committee. The proposed targets take into account changing demographics in the province and the University's context (i) within the province of Manitoba, where it is distinguished from other institutions by its size, research intensity, the number of graduate and professional program offerings, and the range and depth of undergraduate programs and (ii) nationally and internationally as a large, research-intensive university and a member of the U15.

- total enrolment of 32,000 FTE
- graduate student enrolment - 20 percent
- ratio of Masters to Doctoral students – 2:1
- international students – 10 percent of undergraduate enrolment, 5 percent of graduate enrolment
- Indigenous student enrolment – 10 percent of undergraduate enrolment, 5 percent of graduate enrolment

To signal the University's intention to increase Indigenous enrolment to correspond to the Indigenous population in Manitoba (based on 2006 Census, Statistics Canada), the Committee is also proposing ten-year Indigenous enrolment targets (to 2022) of 15 percent undergraduate enrolment and 8 percent graduate enrolment. Ms. Gottheil noted that Indigenous enrolment targets are aggressive, saying it will be important to cultivate the pipeline of Indigenous students from secondary to undergraduate studies and from undergraduate to graduate studies. She observed that current international graduate student enrolment (22.6 percent) exceeds the proposed target, so consideration might turn to international enrolment targets across programs or to services and supports required by this group of students.

Ms. Gottheil and Dean Doering indicated that the SEM Planning Committee is considering five-year targets for student outcomes, including increasing:

- undergraduate persistence from 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> year by 5 percent (to 90 percent)
- undergraduate graduation rate (full-time students at the end of the 6th year) by 10 (to 65 percent)
- Master's student graduation rate (at the end of 5<sup>th</sup> year) by 12 percent (to 83 percent), with a reduced average time-to-completion of 27 months
- Doctoral student graduation rate (at the end of 9<sup>th</sup> year) by 4.5 percent (to 75 percent), with an average time-to-completion of 60 months

Ms. Gottheil identified a number of challenges to achieving the proposed enrolment targets. Two target populations, Indigenous and international students, face challenges to access and success, including: (i) financial support; (ii) academic preparedness; (iii) information and encouragement to enter post-secondary education and to continue on to graduate study; and (iv) an unwelcoming campus climate that discourages persistence. Other challenges to

be addressed include: (i) a large commuter population; (ii) swirling of students between programs and between post-secondary institutions; (iii) increasing numbers of part-time students; (iv) the negative impact of lighter course loads on time-to-completion and graduation rates; and (v) poor self-confidence and self-esteem in the absence of role models at home or in the community who have pursued post-secondary studies.

Ms. Gottheil said there would be implications to setting enrolment targets; for example, increasing graduate enrolment might require capping undergraduate enrolment or shifting enrolment to particular programs. Resource constraints might require that decisions be made to direct funding to meet particular goals. Some targets might have implications for student housing, services, and supports. It would also be important to seek the support of the wider community and the provincial government by clearly communicating the reasons for establishing particular enrolment targets.

Ms. Gottheil indicated that the SEM Planning Committee will continue to engage in discussions at faculty councils and other venues. She reported that meetings had taken place with the Dean/Director and Associate Dean(s) of each faculty and school to discuss program specific enrolment targets. The results of those discussions, including revised program enrolment targets, will be shared with Senate at a future meeting. The Committee will also develop an SEM Planning Framework for consideration by Senate and the Board of Governors.

The Chair thanked Ms. Gottheil and Dean Doering for the presentation.

Professor Churchill and others suggested that Senate would require additional institutional and comparative data when the SEM Planning Framework is brought forward for consideration. Observing that family income and parents' level of education are the best predictors of undergraduate student success, Professor Churchill, suggested, as an example, that undergraduate student demographics might be useful for assessing whether better undergraduate student outcomes can be achieved by improving practices and procedures at the University rather than by restricting access.

Professor Kettner supported the idea that SEM planning should start with the University's mission. He suggested that, because the University's mission statement is rather general, it might not be helpful for answering the question, "Who are we?" It also does not provide insights into the types of students the University might want to enroll or how to deliver an outstanding student experience. He asked if it would be useful to refine the mission statement before addressing the question of whether the University's enrolment strategy is consistent with its mission.

Professor Kettner proposed that the University might follow up with graduates to ascertain whether they have succeeded in applying the higher education and training they have received. He contended that, without this data, the University is using only intermediate measures (graduation rates, time-to-completion) to assess student outcomes.

Professor Kettner said that, even if one accepts the premise that post-secondary institutions should not all be the same, it would be difficult to define what the University's goals and enrolment strategies should be without understanding those of other post-secondary institutions in the province and, perhaps, also in national and global contexts. He asked if there would be an opportunity for the University to engage with other institutions in the province in order to develop a comprehensive or complementary enrolment strategy that would, perhaps, be clearer in terms of the University's overall mission. Dr. Barnard replied that, for a number of years, COPSE has had as part of its mandate an objective to develop a plan for the system of higher education in the province. He proposed that, in the absence of directions from COPSE, the University might determine the particular contributions it could make to the province and the people of Manitoba, if there were to be a differentiated system, and shape itself accordingly.

Professor Gabbert said it imperative that the University determine its own strategic enrolment management strategy and arrive at a clear statement of what the University will contribute, with some level of consensus from the University community. To wait for COPSE to define the University's place in the post-secondary system in the province would be a dereliction of the University's duty to determine its own priorities.

Several members remarked on the need for additional data that would illuminate the relationship between levels of graduate student support and (i) graduate enrolment and (ii) graduate student outcomes, including average time-to-completion. Members suggested that higher proportions of graduate enrolment and shorter times-to-completion at other institutions (see slides 27 – 29, 41, 42) might be explained by higher levels of graduate support. Professor Wrogeman noted that successful research programs and grant support are required to attract graduate students, who are also essential to the success of faculty members' research programs. Dr. Barnard added that a number of provincial governments allocate block grants for graduate student support to universities in their jurisdictions. The lack of similar funding in Manitoba might explain, in part, the lower graduate enrolment levels.

Professor McIlwraith asked if the U15 has comparative information on guaranteed levels of support for graduate students, including, for example, funding from research assistantships and teaching assistantships. Dean Whitmore agreed that this information is important but suggested that it will be difficult to gather information on minimum levels of graduate support given the variety of sources of funding and because the minimum amounts will vary by department within each institution. Ms. Lussier (Director, Office of Institutional Analysis) replied that the U15 group collects some information on teaching assistantships and sessional appointments, so it might be possible to extract some information. She might also consult with colleagues at the other institutions.

Professor Desai suggested there is a relationship between successful graduate programs and attached undergraduate programs, as teaching assistantships provide a stable source of graduate student funding. She asked if it would be possible to receive information, for the University of Manitoba and other

members of the U15, on the number of graduate programs at each institution that do not have attached undergraduate programs. If there is a lower completion rate in these programs, it might be explained by lower amounts of graduate student support.

Professor McIlwraith asked if there is information available on policies regarding graduate supervision at other U15 institutions, including who is eligible to supervise graduate students and the maximum number of graduate students a supervisor can accept. He noted that, at some institutions, only faculty who demonstrate a successful record of supervision, hold a research grant, and/or have an active research program can accept graduate students. Dean Doering replied that most universities in the U15 and in Canada require that faculty members earn membership in the faculty of graduate studies (or equivalent) based on a range of factors including research grants, publications, and record of satisfactory supervision. Membership in the faculty is renewed on a 5- or 7-year cycle, based on performance. The University of Manitoba differs in that faculty members have the privilege to supervise graduate students by virtue of holding the rank of Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor.

Referring to slide 19, Mr. Botha questioned why targets are not being proposed for quality of students. He surmised that universities with higher graduation rates recruit better students by setting higher admission averages. Ms. Gottheil confirmed that this is the case for the institution with the highest graduation rate (90 percent) shown on slide 40. She said the SEM Planning Committee has identified correlations between admission averages and rates of graduation and withdrawal at the University. The question of whether the University should restrict access by increasing admission standards is a sensitive issue that the University community must grapple with collectively. It will be important to consider the implications of increasing admission standards given the University's obligation to the broader community and to Indigenous communities, in particular, to provide access to post-secondary education. Ms. Gottheil acknowledged the possibility of raising admission standards in some programs while simultaneously increasing enrolment in access programs. She reminded members that some programs already have very high admission standards.

Professor Desai asked if data on undergraduate graduation rates at the University (slide 40) take into account that many students graduate with three-year degrees. She requested that, when the SEM Planning Framework is brought forward, Senate receive information on admission requirements at other institutions and current enrolment strategies at the University. She suggested the University might consider ways that it can work with secondary schools in the province to better prepare students for post-secondary study.

Professor Ouellette confirmed, based on feedback from students in the Access and Aboriginal Focus Programs, Faculty of Extended Education, that Aboriginal students do find the campus unwelcoming in some ways. When students leave their program they sometimes indicate it is because they do not feel they have a relationship with their professors. Professor Ouellette reminded Senators that many Aboriginal students have had difficult lives and, as a result, this group of students has more needs than other student populations. Considering that

Access programs are costly, he suggested that, if the University is to meet proposed targets for Indigenous student enrolment, faculty members might have to consider how they could build relationships with students. He recognized that building mentoring relationships with two to four students, for example, would require a great deal of effort and time on the part of faculty.

Recalling a recent presentation by the Campus Planning Office (Senate, November 7, 2012), Professor Brabston suggested SEM objectives might be communicated to the CPO so campus planning activities could take them into account. Dr. Barnard agreed, noting that development of a mixed-use program in the Southwood precinct offers an opportunity to address housing needs of Indigenous and international students and the unwelcoming campus climate.

Ms. Black asked if new targets would be set for international undergraduate enrolment given that the University has reached the proposed target; perhaps, setting a higher target or increasing student supports. Ms. Gottheil replied that, recognizing the University also has obligations to domestic students, the SEM Planning Committee has determined that 10 percent is an appropriate target at present. An advisory committee has been struck to consider matters related to international recruitment. A second advisory committee may be established to consider the particular supports and services required by international students, including but not limited to student residences. Dr. Barnard remarked that a recent report prepared for the federal government<sup>1</sup> recommends doubling the number of international students in Canada by 2022. Considering the level of interest generated by the report in Ottawa, the University may wish to revisit international student enrolment targets in the future.

Given that enrolment at the University is approaching capacity, Professor Morrill proposed that the review of the International College of Manitoba (ICM) might look at whether or not the allocation of residence and classroom spaces to ICM students and students would make the best use of scarce resources, should the University's agreement with Navitas be renewed.

Dr. Keselman remarked that it had been a challenge to compile the data used to set the proposed SEM targets and she thanked Ms. Gottheil, Ms. Lussier, and Dr. Collins for their efforts. She said the University had recently gained access to more data when it became a member of the U15. The Chair explained further that the U15 has a number of data sharing projects and the University had rapidly participated in all of them so it could access the data.

## **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.

The following question was received from Professor Klaus Wrogemann, Faculty of Medicine.

---

<sup>1</sup> Advisory Panel on Canada's International Education Strategy, Final Report, August 2012, *International Education: A Key Driver of Canada's Future Prosperity*

We are hearing a lot of praise on various ROSE projects, but also the criticism that more and more tasks are unloaded onto the shoulders of the people that justify the existence of the University, i.e., students and academic staff.

In my simplistic view of a university the main function of the support services is to provide just that, support for students and academic staff, to help them compete successfully in this world.

I therefore ask: "When ROSE projects are being planned, is careful consideration given to the question: Will it help students and staff to make their life more efficient and competitive or will it unload extra tasks onto their shoulders?" If the answer to the latter is "yes", then I think the project should not be done, unless the savings are truly astronomical.

President Barnard observed that the University is involved in multiple missions, including learning, discovery, and community engagement. Funding from a variety of sources - government grants, student fees, and gifts from donors - must be used effectively to support the various missions. Two objectives of the ROSE projects are to improve services and to ensure resources are being used as effectively as possible. A number of ROSE projects are designed to bring business processes in line with those of other similar organizations for reasons of efficiency. Faculty members, students, and staff have been engaged throughout the development of each of the ROSE projects, which were selected taking into consideration the needs of each of these groups.

President Barnard identified a number of successes of the ROSE Program that have directly benefitted members of the University. Implementation of online bursary and award applications and eligibility checking has improved the award application process for students. Admissions projects have improved the application process for prospective undergraduate and graduate students by enabling online applications. Research Services' contracting project has resulted in the creation of contract templates that have reduced the work involved for researchers dealing with potential funders. A new email and calendar system has much higher performance and stability than the previous systems. Dr. Barnard acknowledged the efforts of those who have been working on the various ROSE projects and members of the University community who have had to learn to processes and adapt to the resulting changes.

Dr. Barnard contended that small savings can aggregate to substantial savings. He observed that, in some jurisdictions, universities are being compelled to achieve substantial savings quickly and sometimes catastrophically. He proposed that it is better that the University take on challenges as they are discovered rather than having solutions imposed from outside. Dr. Barnard expressed his confidence that the cumulative benefits of the ROSE projects will serve the institution well in the long run.

Professor Wrogemann proposed that one consideration should be whether a new program would save time for the end-users. Savings of time are important as the success of the University, as it is measured against other institutions, relates to the success of graduate students and researchers and the services in place to support them. The Chair agreed, noting that time must be allowed for people to become familiar with the new systems before a point of stability is reached and efficiencies are realized.

VI **CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 5, 2012**

Professor Brabston MOVED, seconded by Professor McMillan, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on December 5, 2012 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

VII **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

1. **Editorial Changes to the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes on Course and Program Changes [November 7, 2012]** *(for information)* Page 18

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

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 19

Comments of the Senate Executive Committee accompany the report on which they are made.

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

Ms. Ducas indicated that, at its next meeting, the Committee would receive two presentations; one from the Campus Planning Office on the Bannatyne Master Campus Plan and one by the Strategic Enrolment Management Committee.

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

1. **Proposal from the Faculty of Arts RE: RE: Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Anthropology** Page 20

Dean Taylor noted that a proposal for a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Anthropology is one part of a realignment of programs in the Department of Anthropology. One objective of the program would be to better serve students who want to proceed to graduate studies in this area. Dean Taylor explained that, in the Faculty of Arts, it is standard for Advanced Major and Honours programs to include 48 and 60 credit hours, respectively, in the program area. The Department has offered a 60 credit hour Advanced Major for some time but has recently amended that program to 48 credit hours (Senate, December 5, 2012). Dean Taylor indicated that no new resources or courses would be required to offer the program.

- a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 48

Dean Frankel reported that the SCCCC supports the proposal for a B.A.(Hons.) in Anthropology.

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

Page 50

Ms. Ducas said the SPPC supports the proposal. She noted that no new resources are required to offer the program, which will use existing courses. Ms. Ducas said the SPPC recommends that a high priority level be assigned to the proposal based on the Committee's criteria for assigning priority to new programs / initiatives.

**Dean Taylor MOVED, seconded by Dean Halden, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve a proposal from the Faculty of Arts regarding the introduction of a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Anthropology.**

**CARRIED**

2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review**  
**RE: Communication of External Accreditation Results**

Page 52

Dr. Collins reported that SCAR had met on November 29<sup>th</sup> to consider a report from his office concerning the communication of external accreditation review results. Dr. Collins said the report shows that most faculties do share some results, but there is quite a lot of variability in the ways in which they do so. The Committee has put forward guidelines for the Communication of External Accreditation Results, as it had been concerned that there should be greater consistency across faculties and more transparency with respect to such communications.

**Dr. Collins MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review concerning guidelines for the Communication of External Accreditation Results, effective upon approval.**

Observing that points a) through f) represent different ways of communicating the same information to the same people, Dean Benarroch suggested the proposed guidelines are excessive, particularly with respect to the large number of people (including all faculty, students, and staff) who would have to be contacted. Dr. Collins replied that object is not to re-express the same information to the same people in different ways. He asserted that there is a need to communicate the results, as every review raises issues that are worthy of debate within the faculty and with students. Dr. Collins clarified that the proposed protocol for communicating accreditation results is intended to serve as a guideline for communicating such results. Faculty deans can develop a specific protocol for their faculty, as indicated in observation 4) of the Committee's report.

Professor Brabston proposed that the guidelines be amended to include communication of accreditation results through public media. Dr. Collins remarked that no faculties do so, at present, but they might consider doing so.

**CARRIED**

X     **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS** - none

XI    **ADJOURNMENT**

      The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 12, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 54, and the Strategic Enrolment Management Planning Framework Presentation, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on January 9, 2013.