

**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. J. Anderson  
Prof. M. Araji  
Ms. B. Arte  
Prof. M. Atleo  
Dean J. Beddoes  
Dean M. Benarroch  
Prof. P. Blunden  
Prof. T. Booth  
Mr. J. Botha  
Mr. S. Bounket  
Very Rev. R. Bozyk  
Prof. M. Brabston  
Ms. M. Brolley  
Prof. A. Chiu  
Prof. N. Chow  
Dr. D. Collins  
Dean N. Davies  
Dean E. Dawe  
Prof. R. Desai  
Dean J. Doering  
Prof. M. Edwards  
Prof. B. Elias  
Prof. J. Embree  
Prof. M. Eskin  
Prof. E. Etcheverry  
Prof. A. Farenhorst  
Prof. M. Gabbert  
Rectrice R. Gagné  
Ms. S. Gottheil  
Dean N. Halden  
Prof. J. Hughes  
Dean A. Iacopino  
Prof. V. Keown  
Dr. J. Keselman  
Prof. J. Kettner  
Prof. W. Kinsner  
Mr. B. Kleinsasser  
Mr. P. Kochan  
Mr. E. Kraut

Prof. L. Landrum  
Prof. J. Linklater  
Prof. A. MacDonell  
Prof. R. McIlwraith  
Prof. A. McIntosh  
Prof. D. McMillan  
Dean D. Mandzuk  
Prof. D. Mann  
Prof. T. Mondor  
Mr. S. Moreno  
Prof. J. Morrill  
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette  
Ms. A. Owuapu  
Prof. T. Podolsky  
Prof. D. Polyzois  
Ms. J. Rebizant  
Ms. J. Sealey  
Prof. H. Soliman  
Mr. L. Solomon  
Prof. B. Southern  
Mr. D. Sushko  
Mr. D. Sytnik  
Prof. R. Tate  
Dean J. Taylor  
Prof. C. Trott  
Dean L. Turnbull  
Prof. H. Unruh  
Prof. P. Venkatesh  
Dean L. Wallace  
Dean J. Watkinson  
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld  
Prof. K. Wrogemann  
Prof. A. Young  
Mr. J. Leclerc,  
University  
Secretary  
Dr. S. Coyston,  
Recording  
Secretary

**Assessors Present**

Mr. J. Adams  
Ms. J. Black  
Ms. J. Chen

Ms. A. Ducas  
Prof. B. Hallman  
Prof. B. Hann  
Dr. G. Glavin  
Mr. C. James  
Prof. T. Kucera  
Mr. N. Marnoch  
Prof. K. Matheos  
Dr. J. Ristock  
Dr. L. Smith  
Ms. D. Young

**Regrets**

Prof. G. Anderson  
Prof. J. Asadoorian  
Mr. R. Buchanan  
Mr. G. Csepregi  
Dean H. Frankel  
Ms. M. Gabbs  
Prof. J. Gilchrist  
Prof. P. Hess  
Prof. P. Hultin  
Prof. T. Ivanco  
Ms. S. Jasper  
Dr. D. Jayas  
Mr. J. Kearsey  
Mr. C. Martin  
Dean B. O'Connell  
Prof. F. Parkinson  
Dean B. Postl  
Dr. H. Secter  
Dean G.  
Sevenhuysen  
Prof. K. Smith  
Prof. D. Smyth  
Dean M. Trevan  
Prof. C. Van Winkle  
Dean M. Whitmore

**Absent**

Prof. B. Amiro  
Prof. B. Bacon

Dr. J. Blatz  
Ms. S.-M. Chaillot  
Prof. D. Churchill  
Mr. I. Cook  
Mr. S. Fazaluddin  
Prof. J. Guard  
Mr. R. Hagemeister  
Prof. J. Hanesiak  
Prof. J. Irvine  
Prof. J. Johnson  
Prof. E. Judd  
Mr. R. Jung  
Prof. A. Katz  
Ms. A. Maqsood  
Ms. V. Marriott  
Mr. J. Ngo  
Mr. J. Ossachuk  
Prof. J. Owens  
Mr. Z. Pan  
Prof. K. Plaizier  
Mr. C. Smith  
Dean R. Stern  
Prof. L. Strachan  
Dr. M. Torchia  
Prof. L. Wang  
Mr. C. Yap

**Also Present**

Dr. J. Cooper  
Ms. K. Denisuik  
Mr. G. Juliano  
Ms. H. Long  
Ms. C. Préjet  
Ms. S. Utsunomiya  
Ms. M. Watson

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Emily Etcheverry, School of Medical Rehabilitation.

**AGENDA**

**I      CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,  
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES – FEBRUARY 2013**

Professor Etcheverry **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 February 8, 2013.

**CARRIED**

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

**III     MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE**

1.      **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes** Page 3  
**RE: Department of Preventive Dental Science, Department of Biological Sciences, and Faculty of Pharmacy [December 6, 2012]**

2.      **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes** Page 4  
**RE: Department of Physiology [December 17, 2012]**

Professor Etcheverry **MOVED**, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, **THAT** Senate approve the Reports of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes concerning (i) the Department of Preventive Dental Science, the Department of Biological Sciences, and the Faculty of Pharmacy [dated December 12, 2012] and (ii) the Department of Physiology [dated December 17, 2012].

**CARRIED**

**IV      MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

1.      **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards - Part A [December 12, 2012]** Page 6

2.      **Student Accessibility Services Annual Report (2011 – 2012)** Page 11

Ms. Usick (Director, Student Advocacy and Accessibility) informed Senate that the Student Accessibility Services Annual Report (2011-2012) is the first such report. Student Accessibility Services (SAS) has collected data in previous years but has not provided a report for the University community. Ms. Usick indicated that the report would be posted on the SAS website.

Ms. Usick acknowledged staff in SAS for their commitment to supporting students with disabilities. She said the areas of disability and accommodation are ever changing and require staff to provide responsive services and supports. Ms. Usick reported that one area in which SAS has fallen behind its counterparts at other universities is the area of assisted/adaptive technologies. A briefing paper outlining the needs for such supports has been prepared and will be circulated to the appropriate bodies.

Professor Kucera remarked that efforts should be made to share the Report with faculty members beyond its inclusion on the Senate agenda and the SAS webpage.

Professor Atleo asked what might account for significant shifts, in some faculties, in the number of students registered with SAS between 2010/2011 and 2011/2012, as indicated in Table 1 of the report. Ms. Christie (Coordinator, Student Accessibility Services) said that in 2010/2011 SAS relied on self-reporting of students. In 2011/2012, the implementation of a database management system that interfaces with Aurora meant more information was available from academic units.

Professor Morrill was struck by the notion that students are under-utilizing services provided by SAS. She raised the possibility of providing workshops for faculty on how to identify students with disabilities and inform them of the services available through SAS. Ms. Usick said University Teaching Services and SAS offer workshops on universal and instructional design but said this is an area that SAS would like to develop further. She noted that the presentation under item V would include information on a workshop that has been developed in response to a recommendation in the Cooper Commission Report.

**3. Annual Report of the University Discipline Committee Page 20**

Mr. Leclerc indicated that Professor Fuchs, Chair of the University Discipline Committee was not available for the meeting. He said the Annual Report consists of data gathered from faculties and schools. The Report is shared with Senate and the Board of Governors for information. It is also circulated to the Associate Deans Undergraduate / University Liaison Officers, for discussion, so that body might discuss areas where there are inconsistencies between units in penalties for similar infractions, for example. Mr. Leclerc said that, in broad terms, the reported number of incidents for various types of infractions remained the same in 2011-2012 as compared to the previous year. One exception is that the incidence of plagiarism increased.

**V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Page 80**

**1. Student Accessibility and Reasonable Accommodation Presentation**

The Chair invited Mr. Juliano (Director, Office of Fair Practices and Legal Affairs), Dr. Smith (Executive Director, Student Services/ Student Affairs), Mr. Leclerc (University Secretary), and Professor Emerita Cooper, to make a presentation on

Student Accessibility and Reasonable Accommodation. A copy of the presentation is appended to the minutes.

Dr. Cooper recalled that Senate had previously discussed the matter of reasonable accommodation, including a discussion of the Report of the *ad hoc* Committee of Senate Executive to Examine Accommodation of Students with Disabilities and Governance Procedures Related to Academic Requirements ('the Cooper Commission Report'). She acknowledged members of the *ad hoc* Committee: Dr. Crooks (past Dean, Faculty of Nursing), Professor Gabbert (Faculty of Arts), Ms. Leclair (student representative, Faculty of Graduate Studies), Dr. Sector (Chancellor), Professor Shalaby (Faculty of Engineering), and Dean Whitmore (Faculty of Science); and resource persons: Mr. Juliano, Dr. Smith, Mr. Leclerc, Ms. Brolley (formerly of the University Secretary's office), and Dr. Coyston.

Dr. Cooper recalled that the *ad hoc* Committee's mandate was to discuss, to consider, and to make recommendations on issues concerning the accommodation of students with disabilities. The Committee had narrowed its focus to a review of: (i) how to balance the University's legal obligation to offer reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities while still protecting and enshrining academic standards; (ii) the types of accommodations that might be offered without compromising academic standards; (iii) who should decide whether accommodations should be offered and, if so, what types; (iv) the types of evidence of disability that should be required; (v) who the decision maker should be expected to consult; (vi) how to ensure timely decisions on accommodations are made so a student's academic progress is not compromised; and (vii) how to protect a student's privacy while assessing a case and implementing accommodations. Dr. Cooper said the Cooper Commission had met eighteen times between February 2011 and February 2012, had heard from experts, researched practices at the University and other institutions, and had sought feedback from the University community. Its final report sets out nine recommendations that were approved by Senate in principle (April 4, 2012). Senate had also asked Senate Executive to develop an implementation plan.

Mr. Juliano described the legal context in which matters concerning student accessibility and reasonable accommodation exist, to elucidate why the University is making efforts to respond to the recommendations of the Cooper Commission. He said the Human Rights Code does not define what a disability is. It only indicates that service providers, including the University, have a duty to accommodate physical and mental disabilities or related characteristics or circumstances. The definition of disability is left to interpretation of the Human Rights Code in case law.

Mr. Juliano suggested that mental disabilities are more challenging to accommodate than physical disabilities because they are more controversial, are hidden, include a wide variety of disorders (including exam anxiety), and have the greatest potential to impact academic standards. Observing that there is debate in the academic community as to whether the University is required to accommodate some forms of mental illness and exam anxiety, in particular, Mr.

Juliano said the courts have made it absolutely clear that there is a duty to accommodate.

Mr. Juliano said the University is required to offer reasonable accommodation that is based on the needs and not the desires of a student. A reasonable accommodation is not necessarily perfect. If a proposed accommodation is reasonable, the student is obligated to accept the offer.

Mr. Juliano identified two arguments a university might make where it denies a request for accommodation. One is undue hardship and the second is to protect the *bona fide* academic requirements of a program. Undue hardship is a concept developed in case law rather than the Human Rights Code and refers to an obligation to accommodate to the point of undue hardship. In the university sector, arguments based on undue hardship typically encompass the cost or inconvenience of providing a particular accommodation. Mr. Juliano said arguments based on undue hardship nearly always fail, as the onus to demonstrate undue hardship is extremely high. For example, if a case were focused on the cost of providing a particular accommodation, the court would consider the context and size of the institution. Given the size of the University's operating budget, the courts would be likely find that the University could allocate resources to the accommodation.

Mr. Juliano said a university could resist a request for accommodation that it does not consider reasonable on the grounds that a particular requirement is a *bona fide* academic requirement (BFAR), as the Human Rights Code allows for discrimination where there is a *bona fide* and reasonable cause. Case law has defined a three-part test that a requirement must meet to be considered a *bona fide* requirement: it is rationally connected to the objective to be accomplished; it has been adopted in good faith; it is really necessary. Mr. Juliano said it is important that each program consider, define, and document its BFARs so the University is in a position to defend the requirements should they be challenged. He noted that professional faculties, which have already defined essential skills for their programs, were able to superimpose accreditation requirements. It will be more challenging to define BFARs in other types of faculties, as it is more difficult to defend one particular method of demonstrating knowledge over another.

Mr. Juliano said that failure to provide reasonable accommodations has legal, financial, and reputational risks for the University. The most difficult cases require significant resources, in terms of both time and money, to fight the claims. Given that claims are not insured, the associated costs, including defense costs and any damages, must be paid from the University's operating budget.

Mr. Juliano identified a number of areas where the University can improve processes for providing accommodation. He said the University sometimes tries to defend decisions on the basis of BFARs but the defense is weakened by the lack of documented BFARs. Faculty members are sometimes not willing to cooperate by providing an accommodation. More commonly, decisions about an appropriate accommodation are not made in a timely manner, which can delay a student's progression or graduation, or the process is not private. Health

information is the most sensitive type of personal information and should be shared only with those who have a need to know. Mr. Juliano suggested that sometimes members of the University community are not respectful of the assessments that SAS staff have made on the basis of medical evidence provided by a student. Where an assessment determines there is credible evidence of a disability, the University is obligated to begin to discuss reasonable accommodations and, he suggested, it is not respectful to the student to question the assessment as it triggers a feeling of unfairness that can sometimes escalate to an appeal.

Dr. Smith said the University strives to ensure an accessible learning and working environment for students and staff and is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. With respect to students, in particular, the University supports an accessible learning environment where students with disabilities who are admitted to the University can gain access to all programs for which they are academically qualified. Dr. Smith said the mission of SAS is to provide services to students with disabilities and to ensure an accessible post-secondary education environment. She indicated that SAS acts as a liaison between students and faculty, staff, and external support agencies. The unit also recommends accommodations for students.

Dr. Smith provided a brief overview of the services provided by staff and student volunteers in SAS. She noted the importance of providing a centralized service that locates expertise in SAS to manage the intake of students with disabilities and the acceptance of documentation. SAS is a confidential office that works closely with students, faculties and schools, and other allied units, including the Student Counseling and Career Centre, University Health Services, Student Advocacy, and the Office of Fair Practice and Legal Affairs. Partnership programs with the Learning Disability Services Clinic are important as they allow for timely assessments and can reduce costs for students who must pay for assessments.

Dr. Smith outlined the steps in the provision of services once a student registers with SAS. She indicated the process sometimes involves the cooperation of high school counselors and parents in the year prior to a student's registration at the University, recognizing that time may be required to put a plan for accommodation in place. Dr. Smith indicated that students are required to provide medical documentation from an accredited health professional, who is also asked to recommend accommodations. A partnership involving the student, the faculty or school, and SAS staff is required to ensure an accommodation plan is successful. Dr. Smith said that most requests involve fairly typical accommodations that are based on best practices and standard accommodations. She referred members to the Student Accessibility Services Annual Report, provided under agenda item IV 2., for examples of typical accommodations, noting that the goal is to be able to provide reasonable accommodation while maintaining the academic integrity of the course requirements.

Dr. Smith described the changing landscape and challenges for practitioners in the area of disability services, including: an increased number of students with disabilities; different types of disabilities presented, many of which are hidden or complex; different approaches to accommodation, such as universal design; the need to constantly revisit and revise both best practices and what is considered reasonable given the presentation of more complex disabilities; better documented academic standards (i.e. BFARs, essential skills); and the role of technologies in providing accommodations.

Dr. Smith said the University is doing a very good job of providing accommodations for students. Expert staff in SAS and the cooperation of faculty members and staff in academic units results in a very high success rate for students. SAS is piloting new best practices including coaching and academic attendant programs and has hired a Health and Wellness Educator. The University has also hired an employee to create a mental health strategy for students and staff, and is in the process of implementing recommendations of the Cooper Commission.

Mr. Leclerc recalled that the Cooper Commission Report includes nine recommendations, which can be grouped into three broad areas: (1) policy development / revisions; (2) academic program standards identification; and (3) education / information and awareness development. He briefly reviewed the various recommendations in each of these areas, as the Cooper Commission Implementation Working Group would bring further recommendations to Senate in the coming months, in order to implement those of the Cooper Commission.

Mr. Leclerc said that, in the area of policy development / revisions, the Cooper Commission Report includes recommendations that the University / Senate: (i) adopt a standard set of definitions of terms related to accommodation; (ii) adopt a new or revised policy regarding accommodation that: reflects the right of students with disabilities to accommodation and the right of the University to uphold academic standards; includes provisions for the delegation of authority regarding who can make decisions about accommodations; and requires faculties and schools to establish an Accessibility Advisory Committee; (iii) establish an Academic Accommodation Appeal Committee of Senate, to hear appeals related to accommodation; and (iv) to revise the Accessibility Policy and Procedures for clarity and specificity. Mr. Leclerc indicated that a number of faculties have already undertaken to develop an Accessibility Advisory Committee.

Mr. Leclerc recalled that, in the area of academic program standards identification, the Cooper Commission had made two recommendations. First, that accredited and professional programs create essential skills and abilities documents that are congruent with requirements of accrediting and/or professional governing bodies, for approval by Senate. Second, that other programs create written rationales for the *bona fide* academic requirements for existing and proposed programs. Mr. Leclerc reported that a sub-group of the Cooper Commission Implementation Working Group, chaired by Dean Taylor and including faculty representatives from across the University, will make recommendations concerning BFARs through Senate.

In the area of education / information, Mr. Leclerc said the Cooper Commission recommended that: (i) education on the duty to provide reasonable accommodation and the procedures to be followed, be provided on a regular basis to the University community; (ii) SAS develop a faculty handbook on accommodating students; and (iii) SAS provide information on the types of accommodations made for different types of disabilities and evolving best practice through an annual report to Senate and on its website. Mr. Leclerc noted that development of the handbook for instructors is in progress and that Senate had received the first annual report of SAS under item IV. 2.

Mr. Leclerc recalled that Senate had approved the recommendations of the Cooper Commission in principle and had asked Senate Executive to develop a plan to implement the recommendations. In May 2012, Senate Executive created the Cooper Commission Implementation Working Group, which is co-chaired by Mr. Leclerc and Dr. Smith, to bring together individuals with expertise to develop a detailed implementation plan. Mr. Leclerc indicated that the Implementation Working Group has met regularly since June 2012. The Group's most recent report, which has been provided under item XI 1 describes the work and progress of the Implementation Working Group and its sub-groups. Dr. Smith added that the Group is committed to ensuring that timelines for completing various tasks are met. In the coming months, the Group expects to bring forward to Senate: a revised policy and procedures on accessibility for students with disabilities; a template for establishing a faculty / school Accessibility Advisory Committee and Accommodations Team; and a template for annual reports of faculty / school Accessibility Advisory Committees. The Group has also made progress on recommendations in the education / information area including the development of a presentation and a schedule for delivering that presentation to units across campus on a regular basis and revisions to the SAS website.

The Chair acknowledged the tremendous amount of work and dedication of individuals who have been involved in the work of the Cooper Commission and now the Implementation Working Group. He asked when the University community might expect the recommendations of the Cooper Commission to be implemented and embedded in ongoing processes and activities. Mr. Leclerc replied that eight of the nine recommendations would likely be embedded by the end of the calendar year. A sub-group is currently working on a recommendation to Senate regarding how to implement the recommendation to establish BFARs and essential skills documents. Implementation will require that supports be in place for academic units to undertake the work involved. Dean Taylor said that the sub-group is developing templates for BFARs and essential skills documents, which would be brought to Senate for approval. Subsequently, academic units would work with University Teaching Services to develop BFARs and essential skills for their programs. He estimated that the process would require two years to complete.

Professor Kettner asked who would serve on the proposed Academic Accommodation Appeal Committee, if it would include student representation, how the committee would be constituted, and who would be the final arbitrator. He suggested that it would be important for the dispute resolution process to be

clear and fair and for the committee to have authority to make decisions. Mr. Leclerc said the details have yet to be worked out and the Implementation Working Group is looking at best practices elsewhere. The idea is that membership would comprise academic staff, primarily, with experience in the areas of disability and accommodation. It would be a small group to ensure that decisions could be made in a timely way.

Professor Kettner asked if consideration has been given to how providing accommodations to students with disabilities might impact other students, including positive and negative impacts associated with engaging with students with disabilities in the classroom or a faculty. Dr. Smith said that students entering the University are used to having students with disabilities in the classroom. Where an instructor is concerned that a recommended accommodation will negatively affect other students in the classroom, staff in SAS would work with the instructor to identify an appropriate accommodation. Similarly, SAS would address situations where a student registers a complaint with Student Advocacy. Dr. Smith said she would communicate Professor Kettner's remarks to Ms. Usick and Ms. Christie for their consideration.

Mr. Juliano added that universities have had some success in defending decisions not to accommodate where the impact of an accommodation would result in undue hardship for other students or, in the context of health sciences programs, where an accommodation would compromise patient safety.

Professor Desai asked if there are examples in case law of a defense based on an argument that a proposed accommodation would compromise academic standards. Mr. Juliano replied that he is not aware of any examples where a court allowed a student to graduate against a university's wishes, which demonstrates the authority that universities have in that realm. The courts and, in Manitoba, the Human Rights Commission, will, however, challenge universities to demonstrate that academic standards would, in fact, be compromised.

Professor Kucera suggested that faculty members have few concerns regarding accommodations in the classroom but concerns commonly arise with regard to accommodations that are to be provided for examinations and assignments. Acknowledging that instructors are not entitled to receive confidential information concerning students' disabilities, he contended that faculty do require more education or information on why different students receive various accommodations and how decisions are made to offer particular types of accommodations. He gave the example of several students being allowed different amounts of time to complete the same examination. Professor Kucera said that faculty sometimes feel they have not been provided with enough information to believe that an accommodation is required. Dr. Smith said the presentation developed by SAS and the Office of Fair Practices and Legal Affairs is designed to provide faculty with information on the areas of disability and accommodation. The faculty handbook that SAS is developing will include general information on how the office determines when a student is entitled to an accommodation and why. It will also include information on how SAS determines the amount of time required by a student to complete an examination. The SAS will reconstitute a Faculty Advisory Committee which, together with the

establishment of faculty / school Accessibility Advisory Committees and Accommodation Teams will provide for better dissemination and sharing of information on a need-to-know basis.

Professor Kucera remarked that creating defensible rationales for BFARs will be a challenging undertaking that might involve controversy amongst faculty within some units and, perhaps, between a program and others outside the program. For example, faculty in the Department of Mathematics would consider that certain technical facilities in basic arithmetic and algebra are BFARs but others outside the faculty might disagree given a perception that mathematics is not required where there are calculators. Mr. Leclerc said that both the Cooper Commission and the current Implementation Working Group recognize the scale of the task of identifying BFARs. He confirmed Professor Kucera's observation that discussion of the BFARs of a program must take place among faculty members and departments, for Senate's approval. He indicated that academic units would be provided with templates to assist in the process. Mr. Juliano added that the objective is to enshrine how academic requirements have always been developed through collegial discussion of different view points, perhaps, to decide on one philosophy over another, and to identify specific requirements of a program offered at a particular institution. He said the requirements would be more defensible once units had gone through the process of creating written rationales for the requirements.

Professor Morrill asked if speed could be considered a BFAR. Mr. Juliano said that, typically, an argument that speed is a BFAR would be a losing one but it would depend on the context. Professor McMillan observed that the speed with which a student can complete particular tasks would sometimes be a BFAR in health sciences programs, as it relates to patient safety.

## **VI 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 questions were received from Professor Peter Blunden, Faculty of Science.

1. The President's Report refers to the upcoming Fort Garry Campus Master Plan project, which will guide the development and use of space and buildings, and make recommendations on reallocations, renovations, and new construction.

What is the makeup of the steering committee providing guidance to this project? In particular, is there sufficient academic expertise to give informed input on the teaching and research functions of the university?

2. The President's Report also refers to the final draft form of the Bannatyne Master Plan. This will be presented to the Presidential Executive Team for approval, following which a number of other steps are outlined. What is the role of Senate in this process?

Mr. Kochan said the Space Master Plan Steering Committee is comprised of Professor Tate (Faculty of Architecture), Mr. Rivers (Director, Physical Plant), Mr. Cunningham (Acting Associate Vice-President, Administration), Dr. Collins (Vice Provost, Academic Programs and Planning), Ms. Ducas (Chair, Senate Planning and Priorities Committee), Ms. Richard, (Director, Campus Planning Office), Mr. Marnoch (Registrar), Mr. Kochan (Vice-President, Administration), Professor Roshko (Associate Dean, Faculty of Science), Ms. Stroud (Space Planner, Campus Planning Office), Ms. Gottheil (Vice-Provost, Students), Ms. Lussier (Director, Institutional Analysis), and Dr. Blatz (Associate Vice-President, Partnerships). He said that, in addition to the guidance provided by the Steering Committee, ECS, the Space Master Plan consultants, would working closely with members of the university community from all units, conducting extensive interviews to gather information that will have an impact on the recommendations made by the consultant, ECS. It is anticipated as the project moves forward, further academic, student, research, and administrative expertise will be brought into the process to provide feedback, advice and guidance.

Responding to Professor Blunden's second question, Mr. Kochan said the Bannatyne Campus Master Plan currently exists as a draft discussion paper and will provide the basis of an extensive engagement process. This process will include engagement and consultation with the university community (faculty, staff and students) and also with the neighborhood in which the Bannatyne campus is situated. Engagement with the university community has recently been initiated and will include community conversations (i.e. smaller-group discussions with stakeholders), larger open house displays with opportunities for feedback and ideas, and, potentially, a walking tour of the surrounding neighborhood to be led by a member of the surrounding community. The engagement process will inform and shape the eventual final draft of the Campus Master Plan, which will be presented to SPPC, Senate, and the Board for approval.

Professor Blunden proposed, given that the Campus Master Plans would have a profound effect on teaching and research spaces and, by extension, teaching and research functions at the University, and considering that Senate has a responsibility to make recommendations to the Board of Governors on campus planning, that Senate be provided with updates on the planning processes, with opportunities to provide feedback on the Campus Master Plans. The Chair remarked and Mr. Kochan confirmed that Senate would be provided with updates on the planning processes. Mr. Kochan suggested that Ms. Ducas, in her capacity as Chair of the SPPC might report to Senate on the work of the work of the Space Master Plan Steering Committee. The Chair concurred that a schedule could be established for Ms. Ducas to provide regular reports to Senate.

Referring to the Report of the President, Professor Kettner asked if Dr. Barnard could provide more information about the outcomes of his meetings with community members concerning engagement of the University with the community. Dr. Barnard said that he meets with members of the community about eight times each year. Some meetings are focused on linkages the University has with particular communities, for example, with other educational institutions or organizations in the inner city. The meetings provide an opportunity to talk about some of the major happenings at the University and to receive community members' feedback. Dr. Barnard indicated that, if any matters arise from those discussions that might be of interest to a particular academic or other unit, he shares that information with the appropriate dean or staff members. He remarked that

the University impinges on and is impinged on by the broader community in many ways, so it is important for faculties and the President's office to keep in touch with the community.

**VII      CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2013**

**Professor Kettner MOVED, seconded by Professor Brabston, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on January 9, 2013 be approved as circulated.**

**CARRIED**

**VIII     BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

1.      **Addendum to the International College of Manitoba  
Annual Report [September 2011 to August 2012]** Page 94

The Chair called attention to an addendum to the International College of Manitoba Annual Report, which had been provided for information.

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

1.      **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 96

Professor Etcheverry reported that Senate Executive had met on January 23, 2013. 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, at its last meeting, the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee had considered undergraduate enrolment targets. She indicated that the Committee would be providing a report to Senate at a later meeting.

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

1.      **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards -  
Part B [December 12, 2012]** Page 97

**Dr. Keselman MOVED, seconded by Dr. Collins, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [dated December 12, 2012].**

**CARRIED**

2.      **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research  
RE: Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes:  
the Manitoba Institute for Materials (MIM)** Page 101

**Dr. Glavin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research on the Periodic Review of the Manitoba Institute for Materials regarding a recommendation that the Institute be renewed for a period of five years, effective upon approval by Senate.**

**CARRIED**

**3. Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations**

Page 105

Professor Edwards referred members to the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations, to fill one leave replacement and two vacancies for student representatives on a number of Senate committees. There were no further nominations.

**Professor Edwards MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated January 11, 2013].**

**CARRIED**

**XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

**1. Report of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission [January 10, 2013]**

Page 106

Dr. Smith (Executive Director, Student Services/Student Affairs) indicated that salient points in the Report of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission had been covered in the presentation under item V.

**XII ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 13, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 107, and the Student Accessibility and Reasonable Accommodation Presentation, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on February 6, 2013.