

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
Prof. G. Anderson
Prof. John
Anderson
Prof. Judith
Anderson
Mr. J. Arcega
Prof. B. Austin-Smith
Dean S. Baum
Dean J. Beddoes
Dean M. Benarroch
Prof. T. Booth
Prof. O. Botar
Prof. M. Brabston
Ms. M. Brolley
Dean. D. Brown
Prof. A. Calder
Prof. M. Campbell
Prof. J. Carlberg
Prof. T. Chen
Prof. P. Dass
Dean N. Davies
Dean J. Doering
Mr. S. Dorge
Dean E. Etcheverry
Prof. T. Falkenberg
Prof. G. Fitzell
Acting Dean
H. Frankel
Prof. M. Gabbert
Prof. G. Giesbrecht
Ms. S. Gottheil
Prof. J. Guard
Dean N. Halden
Prof. R. Hechter
Dean G. Hepburn
Prof. P. Hess
Prof. D.
Hiebert-Murphy
Prof. J. Honeyford
Prof. T. Ivanco
Ms. S. Jordan

Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. J. Kettner
Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. P. Kochan
Prof. L. Landrum
Ms. H. Loewen
Prof. A. MacDonell
Prof. D. MacPherson
Ms. J. McConnell
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. A. McNicol
Mr. B. Mahatoo
Dean D. Mandzuk
Ms. K. Marcynuk
Prof. A. Menkis
Dean B. O'Connell
Mr. S. O'Connor
Dr. C. Ould Moulaye
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. F. Parkinson
Mr. H. Piyadasa
Prof. D. Polyzois
Ms. E. Popowich
Prof. C. Rocke
Ms. A. Roscoe
Mr. R. Sherbo
Ms. G. Sidhu
Dean R. Stern
Ms. S. Tappia
Prof. R. Tate
Dean J. Taylor
Ms. H. Teklemariam
Mr. A. Thapa
Prof. C. Trott
Dean L. Turnbull
Prof. H. Unruh
Prof. B.-C. Wang
Prof. L. Wang
Mr. Q. Watt
Dean K. Wittenberg
Prof. A. Young
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,
Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

Dr. D. Collins
Ms. A. Ducas
Dr. G. Glavin
Prof. M. Hudson
Ms. R. Kunzman
Prof. K. Matheos
Ms. L. Rempel
Dr. J. Ristock
Prof. G. Smith
Dr. D. Stewart
Dr. M. Torchia

Regrets

Mr. J. Adams
Ms. P. Bachewich
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. D. Brewin
Prof. F. Burczynski
Prof. P. Cattini
Prof. A. Chiu
Recteur G. Csepregi
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. J. Embree
Mr. G. Farthing
Ms. M. Furgale
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Prof. P. Hultin
Dr. D. Jayas
Mr. J. Kearsey
Mr. J. Lieberman
Dean B. Postl
Ms. A. Prychitko
Ms. M.-J. Romaniuk
Dr. H. Sector
Ms. R. van Ginkel
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld
Ms. D. Young

Absent

Ms. O. Alaka
Prof. M. Araji
Dr. J. Blatz

Ms. S. Connelly
Ms. S. Dveris
Prof. B. Elias
Prof. R. Eni
Prof. D. Funk
Prof. B. Hallman
Dean A. Iacopino
Prof. E. Judd
Mrs. V. Keown
Prof. S. McClement
Ms. T. McVannel
Mr. N. Marnoch
Dean J. Mulvale
Prof. T. Papakyriakou
Ms. C. Plumton
Prof. D. Smyth
Mr. A. Turnbull

Also Present

Ms. D. Bennet
Prof. P. Bose
Prof. R. Cardwell
Prof. R. Chernomas
Prof. J. Compton
Mr. J. Danakas
Ms. C. Davidson
Ms. A. Domingo
Mr. G. Dyck
Mr. R. From
Ms. L. Halket
Mr. B. Hughes
Ms. F. Lee
Prof. R. Lobdell
Mr. T. Rogge
Prof. J. Serieux
Ms. V. Shantz
Prof. W. Simpson
Ms. E. Stone
Ms. P. Trupish
Ms. S. Utsunomiya
Ms. M. Watson
Mr. J. Wilson

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Diana McMillan, College of Nursing.

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE - none

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards** Page 3
[February 17, 2015]

2. **In Memoriam: Dr. Helen Preston Glass** Page 18

On behalf of the College of Nursing, Professor McMillan offered a memorial tribute to Dr. Helen Preston Glass, former Director of the School of Nursing. Dr. Glass was a dedicated nurse and visionary who had played a pioneering role in advancing the nursing profession. Her contributions to nursing education and to health care policy development, and particularly to the development of new polices as healthcare shifted from institutional care to community-based health promotion strategies, are recognized nationally and internationally. Dr. Glass was a member of the Manitoba Order of the Buffalo Hunt, an Officer of the Order of Canada, and an Officer of the Order of Manitoba.

3. **Suspension of Admissions to the M.Sc. in** Page 19
Family Social Sciences, May 2015 – May 2016

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Page 20

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 Hudson, UMFA Assessor:

President Barnard has read statements regarding the CAUT investigations into the minutes of the last two Senate meetings and has included comments from academics who have supported his position. Dr. Barnard, have you contacted individuals with different perspectives and whom you have named in your statements, e.g., Robert Chernomas, Mark West, to hear from them on their experiences and issues?

President Barnard said he had heard from many members of the Department of Economics and the Faculty of Architecture during the last several months. He said he and the Provost had met with the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Architecture, to stress the need for colleagues to work together and to take into account the effect of recent events in the Faculty on students and staff members. Noting that the Dean's term continues to the end of August, Dr. Barnard said the Provost has solicited advice from the Faculty and will make a recommendation regarding arrangements thereafter once

she has considered the advice that is received. He said that he and the Provost are open to meeting with the Department of Economics at the appropriate time.

Dr. Barnard said Professor West had directed his letter of resignation to him. He had acknowledged it and wished Professor West well in his next position. Dr. Barnard said that otherwise he has not personally contacted either Professor Chernomas or Professor West. He noted, in addition, that neither of these individuals had contacted him on matters concerning their respective units either before or after the CAUT investigations were initiated.

The following question was received from Professor Young, Faculty of Arts:

Will the administration consider altering the rules and date of the University's fiscal year end, rules and timing that make it very difficult for small units to plan their budgets effectively?

At present, most expenses have to be completely processed by financial services by 31 March, or in some cases even earlier, in order to be allocated to the current budget year. Because the budget rules are so restrictive, with no allowance for any carry-over, units typically take care not to overspend and often wait until late in the year to make strategic purchases. As a result, the processing of expenses by financial services is slower at the end of the budget year and many expenses, although submitted in good time, are not processed by 31 March and are charged to the budget of the next year, a budget that is not assigned to departmental units until much later, sometimes as late June or July. The result is that units are unable to plan their expenditures effectively. It is risky, for example, to plan speakers or events after the end of February, because all the expenses may not be processed in time to meet the year end cut-off. This means that units are effectively left with no usable discretionary funds from the end of February until June or July of each year. Academic units are left without resources to fund events for graduating students, for professional development workshops for graduate students, or for events to recruit students to our programs. A fiscal year-end that accorded with the academic calendar would enable academic units to plan events for students and faculty through to the end of the winter term at least and would also enable units to help celebrate the achievements of both graduating and continuing students at the end of term or at Convocation.

The rigidity, and indeed illogicality, of the budget processing deadline leads to needless stress for unit administrators and support staff, as well as for the staff in financial services and its cognate departments, who work very hard to get claims processed in a timely way. Will the administration revert to the earlier practice, a practice in force in bureaucracies as unforgiving as the Canada Revenue Agency, that accepts claims on the date they are submitted, rather than the date on which the processing of the claim is completed by financial services. Date of submission is something units have some control over; date of processing is not, and should not be used as a means to deny units access to the funds assigned to them.

Mr. Kochan said section 61 of the University Act stipulates that the fiscal year ends on March 31st, so the University cannot alter the date. Other deadlines have been set to

ensure that processing of expense claims and audits are completed in time to prepare the University's financial statements, which are reported to the Board of Governors in June. Mr. Kochan said March 31st is the date by which goods must be received or services must be rendered, but invoices can be submitted subsequent to that date. He said he is confident that expenses are charged to the correct financial year, including where invoices are submitted after the end of March but would be interested in receiving information where this might not have occurred. Referring to Professor Young's remark that there is no allowance for carry-over, Mr. Kochan said there are significant carryover funds, as reported at the January Senate meeting.

Professor Young contended based on experiences in her unit that Financial Services' practice is to debit funds for the fiscal year in which a claim is processed versus that in which an expense was incurred. In instances where a claim involves a number of expenses, none of those are processed before Financial Services has received all of the invoices relating to that particular claim. Even where all of the expenses had been incurred and paid during the previous fiscal year, if the final receipt is submitted after March 31st, the entire claim would be debited from the unit's budget for the fiscal year in which the last receipt was received. Professor Young said departments could not plan for this, particularly because they do not have access to any carryover funds. She asked whether it is necessary for the Board of Governors to receive the University's financial statements in June or if this deadline could be moved to a date later in the year. Mr. Kochan said the June deadline to provide the University's financial statements to the Board is not based on the University's fiscal year-end but the date by which the University must provide its financial statements to the province.

The Chair suggested that Mr. Kochan and Professor Young might continue the discussion outside of the meeting, as it is not a matter to be determined by Senate.

The following question was received from Professor Chen, Faculty of Arts:

Given that the declared financial crisis and proposed cuts (a) directly impact individual faculty member's workload as well as the viability of diverse programs, and that faculty and unit-level administrative staff are being stretched to the limit which results in overtime hours by staff and countless essentially unpaid extra hours by faculty because the staff available for various responsibilities is reduced; and (b) students are already experiencing serious negative effects because of decreased course offerings, larger class sizes, under-maintained classrooms and buildings, less contact time with faculty members outside of the classroom, and constant anxiety about rising tuition and costs of education, can you explain how the University administration feels it is appropriate to request monetary donations from faculty and students for the 'Front and Centre' campaign? How does this administration justify this request to faculty, students, and staff for donations - and the resources spent on this campaign- as anything other than an indicator that the University is out-of-touch with the deteriorating everyday conditions and state of education and research that are a result of the spending priorities of the University of Manitoba in the current financial situation?

Dr. Barnard said the University of Manitoba invites all of its stakeholders to support its mission and vision through philanthropy. Many staff and faculty make contributions to the University, as they believe in the importance of supporting students and in the University's teaching, research, and outreach activities. Dr. Barnard said the faculty,

staff, and retirees campaign provides an opportunity for a conversation with important groups about the impact of philanthropy on the lives of students and the well-being of the University community. He noted that the campaign is an invitation to participate and anyone who is invited is free to decline to participate.

Dr. Barnard said the faculty, staff, and retirees campaign does have a goal to raise money, to support programs that these groups of stakeholders have identified as being important to the institution and the University community. He reported that the number of individuals participating in the campaign has nearly doubled over the previous year, from 3.5 percent in 2013/2014 to 6.7 percent in 2014/2015. He said that, in the last three years, \$1.4 million had been raised through the campaign to support research and learning activities at the University. He suggested that it would be irresponsible not to ask given people's expressed reasons for contributing, which include pride, belief in what is accomplished, and the potential for the University to accomplish more with their gifts.

Dr. Barnard thanked members of Senate who do contribute to the campaign. He also thanked, in particular, Dean Etcheverry, Ms. Cyr (Director, Aboriginal Student Centre), and Dr. Sitar (Professor Emeritus), who are the co-Chairs of the current faculty, staff, and retirees campaign.

Dr. Barnard reported that, as of March 31, 2015, the University had raised \$36 million and had exceeded its target of \$28 million for the 2014/2015 fiscal year. The monies will be directed to graduate and undergraduate student support, classroom and laboratory renovations, research activities, and teaching support.

VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2015

Professor Kettner MOVED, seconded by Professor Judy Anderson, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on March 4, 2015 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

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 31

Professor McMillan said the Executive Committee met on March 18, 2015. Comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they are made.

2. Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

Ms. Ducas said the committee has completed its deliberations on a proposal to establish an articulation agreement between the University of Manitoba and UCSI University in Kuala Lumpur, concerning programs offered by the Faculty of Engineering.

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

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 32
 RE: Proposal for Special Consideration Admissions
 Category for the Diploma in Agriculture, Faculty of
 Agricultural and Food Sciences

Ms. Gottheil referred members to a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences to create a Special Consideration category for admission to the Diploma in Agriculture. The intent is to attract and enroll Indigenous students in the program. Ms. Gottheil said the proposed admission category is similar to Special Consideration admission categories previously established for other programs. It is also consistent with the strategic priorities of the Faculty and the University to increase Indigenous student enrolment.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal for a Special Consideration Admissions Category for the Diploma in Agriculture, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, effective for the September 2016 intake.

CARRIED

2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction** Page 37
 and Evaluation RE: Revised Entrance, Continuation,
 and Graduation Requirements, B.Sc.(Hons.)
 in Psychology

Dr. Ristock said the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation (SCIE) endorses a proposal from the Faculty of Science to revise the entrance, continuation, and graduation requirements for the Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Psychology, as set out in the Report. The revised requirements would align with the same requirements for the Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Psychology that were previously approved by Senate (May 2014).

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding revised Academic Regulations concerning Entrance, Continuation, and Graduation Requirements for the Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Psychology, Faculty of Science, effective September 2015.

CARRIED

3. **Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and** Page 43
 Procedures RE: Revisions to the Faculty of
 Agricultural and Food Sciences Council Bylaws

Dean Doering said the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences has proposed that section V (2)(a)(iii) of its Council Bylaws be amended to clearly articulate that the Curriculum Committee has the authority to make recommendations to Faculty Council with respect to individual students' programs.

Dean Doering MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures concerning revisions to the Faculty of Agricultural and Foods Sciences Council Bylaws, effective upon approval by Senate.

CARRIED

4. Reports of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes

a) RE: Department of Entomology

Page 47

Dean Doering said that, in response to a recommendation in a recent graduate program review, the Department of Entomology is proposing to reduce the number of credit hours required for an M.Sc. or a Ph.D. in Entomology from 12 to 6 credit hours. The Department is also proposing that Direct Entry Ph.D. students or students who transfer into a Ph.D. program having completed the first eighteen months of an M.Sc. would be required to complete 12 credit hours of coursework.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Dean Etcheverry, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes concerning program changes in the Department of Entomology, effective September 1, 2015.

CARRIED

b) RE: Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics

Page 50

Dean Doering said that, in response to recommendations in a graduate program review, the Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics is proposing to reduce the required number of credit hours from 12 to 9 credit hours, for the Masters program, and from 12 to 6 credit hours for the Doctoral program. Direct Entry Ph.D. students or students who transfer into a Ph.D. program having completed the first eighteen months of an M.Sc. would be required to complete 15 credit hours of coursework. In addition, the revised curricula would require that all students complete PHAC 7222 – Molecular Pharmacology.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor Judy Anderson, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes concerning program changes in the Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics, effective September 1, 2015.

CARRIED

c) RE: Master of Dentistry in Pediatric Dentistry

Page 55

Dean Doering said the Master of Dentistry in Pediatric Dentistry was being revised to correct a number of errors contained in the original program proposal. The errors, which involved an error in addition in one

instance and the weighting of two courses as 3 credit hour rather than 6 credit hour courses in the other, had resulted in a miscalculation of the total credit hours of core courses required for the program. Dean Doering said that, in addition, the elective course NATV 2100 would be removed from the curriculum and would be replaced by NATV 3240, which would be a compulsory course. The modified program would total 63 credit hours.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor Brabston, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes concerning modifications to the Master of Dentistry in Pediatric Dentistry, effective September 1, 2015.

CARRIED

5. Proposal for Direct Entry Process, Faculty of Science

a) Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation

Page 57

Dr. Ristock said SCIE supports a proposal from the Faculty of Science to introduce academic regulations concerning an entrance process for Direct Entry students admitted to that Faculty. The Faculty is proposing to admit Direct Entry students to an undeclared four-year Bachelor of Science (Major) program rather than the three-year Bachelor of Science (General) degree. The objective is to encourage more students to complete a four-year degree, which would better prepare students for graduate studies or a career in science or admission to professional programs. Direct Entry students who, having completed 24 – 30 credit hours, either do not meet the entrance requirements for a four-year degree program or wish to complete a three-year degree would be able to transfer into the B.Sc.(Gen.) degree.

b) Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

Page 61

Ms. Ducas said Senate Executive had referred the proposal to the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC), to consider the potential resource implications. Senate Executive had observed that, given that 75 percent of Science students complete a three-year degree, were the implementation of the proposed Direct Entry process to result in a greater proportion of Science students completing a four-year Bachelor of Science degree, a significant number of students who otherwise would have completed only 90 credit hours of coursework, would be required to complete 120 credit hours. Ms. Ducas said the Faculty estimates that, if the entrance process for Direct Entry students were implemented, it would require an additional \$70,000 per year to support enrolment of an additional 240 students, at most, in the four-year degree programs. Using 2014 data on the numbers of available spaces in 3000 - and 4000 - level courses, the Faculty had determined that additional course sections would be required only in Biological Sciences and Computer Science.

Ms. Ducas said the SPPC had determined that implementation of the Direct Entry process would not have significant resource implications. The committee had noted that the Faculty had estimated potential costs based on the most costly scenario. The SPPC had also observed that the Direct Entry process would facilitate planning in the Faculty, as Direct Entry students would be required to declare a four-year Major or Honours program once they had completed 24 to 36 credit hours.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committees, THAT Senate approve a proposal for a Direct Entry Process, Faculty of Science, effective September 1, 2016.

CARRIED

X ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. Discussion of the President's February 4, 2015 Statement to Senate

Dr. Barnard reminded Senators that, at the February 4th meeting, he had made a statement on the CAUT Report on the Department of Economics and had indicated that Senate would be provided with an opportunity to discuss the statement at a future meeting. He recalled that, in his introductory remarks, he had asked Senators to consider, as a Senate and as representatives of the larger University community, how best to bring the institution's ideals to bear in this difficult situation. In his closing remarks, he had asked Senate to consider how it would (i) support colleagues in the Department of Economics in the shared work of learning, discovery, and engagement carried out at the institution; (ii) demonstrate a commitment to the values set out in the Strategic Plan, 2015 – 2020, including academic freedom, accountability, collegiality, equity and inclusion, excellence, innovation, integrity, respect, and sustainability; and (iii) move forward to strengthen the work of the University and all of its constituent parts. Dr. Barnard recalled that he had also noted, at the time, that the Dean of Arts continued to work with the Head and others to move forward in the Department. He had called upon Senate to support members of the Department in their scholarship, teaching, and applied work. He had also indicated that he would support their joint efforts to govern themselves.

Dr. Barnard said that, since the February meeting, there has been considerable discussion and many communications concerning his statement on the CAUT Report. Observing that he and the Provost have been criticized by various members of the University for supporting the Dean's work with the Department, Dr. Barnard said he had felt it was important to respect ongoing processes in the Department and had hoped that various views held by different groups within the Department, which are presented as polarities in the CAUT Report, could, in fact, coexist.

Dr. Barnard said he would be open to various options moving forward. He restated his view that collegial processes underway within the Department of Economics and the Faculty of Arts should be allowed to continue to their conclusion. He said it is important that academics have an opportunity to carry out collegial processes in their unit and that Administration intervene only in

extreme cases when other options have been exhausted. Noting that it would not be appropriate for Senate to attempt to resolve issues internal to the Department, Dr. Barnard invited members to offer their reactions to, and advice on, the broad issues discussed in his statement.

Professor Guard said she was disappointed by the President's response to the CAUT Report because, in her view, it minimizes the extent of the problems in the Department by, she alleged, attributing them to a minority of department members. She contended that many at the University, including senior administrators, are aware that the problems are acute and long-standing. Speaking as a former member of the Department, she said these long-standing problems have created a poisoned work environment within the Department for at least some of its members, including her. Professor Guard noted for the record that she is a feminist, in terms of both her personal politics and scholarship.

Professor Guard suggested the problem is not with the CAUT Report but with senior Administration's failure to address the situation in the Department of Economics in a fair and balanced manner. She said the heterodox group is not a tiny minority in the Department. She estimated that one quarter and perhaps as many as one third of Department members would identify themselves as heterodox scholars. She contended that, regardless of the numbers, when those who hold a minority view within a department appear to be discriminated against by the majority, it is the job of management to protect them. She reasoned that the role of senior administrators is not to lead or represent only majorities but to also take into consideration the contributions of collegial minorities. Professor Guard suggested that interventions that have been made by Administration have only served to exacerbate the long-standing problems within the Department. She contended that one result has been a diminution of academic freedom, which, she suggested, is exemplified by members of the heterodox minority losing their courses and being shut out of graduate supervision and teaching based on decisions taken by the majority. Professor Guard said that, in her view, the President's response to the CAUT Report discredits the heterodox minority in the Department. She informed Senate that these individuals are active scholars with substantial publication records and international research reputations.

Dr. Barnard responded that his statement is clear that Senate should support colleagues in the Department as they do their work. He indicated that that remark is meant to refer to all colleagues in the Department.

Professor Gabbert disclosed that he is a member of the CAUT Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee that approved the CAUT Report on the Department of Economics. He said CAUT investigations typically occur where CAUT members have appealed for help in situations where local efforts to resolve concerns regarding academic freedom appear to have failed. Where there appear to be grounds for concern, the CAUT appoints a committee to investigate.

Professor Gabbert took the view that the Administration's response to the CAUT Report on the Department of Economics is problematic in several respects. First, he asserted that the focus on the lack of jurisdiction of the CAUT in matters covered in the Report is a red herring, given that the CAUT has never claimed

any administrative or other jurisdiction over a university. He said the CAUT has a mandate to represent the interests of its constituency, which comprises thousands of Canadian academics, including all regular members of the academic staff at the University of Manitoba. It has a long-standing practice of investigating matters that relate to possible violations of academic freedom. Professor Gabbert said it is not improper for CAUT investigators to request to hear what CAUT members and others, including students, might have to say about such matters, and contended, therefore, that there is no issue of jurisdictional infringement. Second, Professor Gabbert said a complaint that the CAUT Report does not represent a sufficiently wide range of views is problematic, as Administration had encouraged academic members not to participate in the investigation. Third, referring to an objection to the use of anonymous materials in the Report, Professor Gabbert noted that, while some sources are not named in the Report, the CAUT investigators do know the sources of all evidence cited. He pointed out that CAUT investigators could not rely on evidence provided by unknown authors. Professor Gabbert observed that, like journalists, CAUT investigators cannot compel anyone to give evidence and so must sometimes rely on witnesses who will only do so on the condition that they not be named, particularly where an intimidating climate that discourages openness may exist. Nor do they have authority to carry out their recommendations or to act on their findings. Professor Gabbert said he is happy that the University has worked to establish procedures to prohibit the use of anonymous materials in various proceedings that can affect the outcome of student or employment status or lead to discipline. He remarked that investigations carried out by university administrators investigating charges of academic fraud or student misconduct, for example, differ in that investigators can impose discipline and also have authority to carry out recommendations or act on their findings. Professor Gabbert said CAUT investigators can only bring attention to a situation and press those who have the authority to do so, to address the problems that the Report claims to have found. He said this is what the CAUT has done in the case of its report on the Department of Economics.

Professor Gabbert observed that University Administration was already familiar with much of what is in the CAUT Report. He observed that, notwithstanding this, Administration has asked Senate to reject the CAUT Report as flawed, because some of those who had given testimony were not named, and to believe that the conflict between the orthodox and heterodox approaches is somehow artificial or contrived. Professor Gabbert said Administration's had access to an arbitrator's report completed in 2010 that attributes problems in the Department to a conflict between heterodox and orthodox groups, on the basis of sworn testimony on both sides of the issue. Administration was also aware of Dean Taylor's decision, in 2011, to cancel a search for a probationary appointment in the Department until concerns regarding the climate in the Department and attitudes toward methodological diversity could be addressed and the Dean's response to an undergraduate program review in the Department, in 2013, which was provided to the Vice-Provost (Integrated Planning and Academic Programs), in which he stresses that curricular changes must not compromise the Department's methodological diversity. Moreover, prior to a recent curriculum review, Dean Taylor had established a committee to address problems with the Department's climate. Professor Gabbert observed that none of these internal processes had effectively dealt with difficulties within the Department. He asked what steps the

Dean would propose to take next, as these do not seem clear, nor have efforts taken by the Dean to this point been successful.

Professor Gabbert said the CAUT Report raises serious allegations that the academic freedom of a number of individuals has been infringed. He said these cannot be ignored or avoided by appeals to the departmental majority, as academic freedom protects individual academics against all forms of institutional censorship and interference, including those arising from inappropriate use of collegial power. He asserted that, to reject this principle as an illegitimate broadening of the notion of academic freedom is not acceptable.

Professor Gabbert alleged that President Barnard's remarks concerning the need to support colleagues in Economics, as the Department deals with internal conflicts, implicitly exclude any concern for the aggrieved heterodox minority that constitutes one quarter of the Department's membership. He recalled that, at the March Senate meeting, the President had indicated a willingness to meet with Mr. Robinson, Executive Director of the CAUT. He noted that, in a letter to Mr. Robinson (dated March 10, 2015) there is no attempt to make arrangements to meet. Professor Gabbert called upon the President to make new efforts to resolve the situation in the Department and suggested that those efforts should include meeting with Mr. Robinson and with the aggrieved in the Department. He said UMFA has indicated its willingness to participate in such efforts. He said that, in his view, any other course of action would risk continuing damage to the rights of colleagues in Economics and to the University's reputation.

President Barnard replied to a number of Professor Gabbert's remarks. He said that, while he might debate some of them, he appreciated Professor Gabbert's conviction. First, he observed based on communications he had received that it is clear that the aggrieved are not only the heterodox minority but the entire Department of Economics. Second, he said the suggestion that he had encouraged individuals not to participate in the CAUT investigation is an overstatement. He recalled that he had advised that individuals were not compelled to participate in the investigation and had reminded people who chose to participate that they could not reveal private and personal information, which one would have expected to be part of the type of investigation to be carried out. Regarding Professor Gabbert's definition of anonymous materials as known to some but not to everyone, Dr. Barnard suggested that this interpretation would not be accepted in many other contexts. Finally, Dr. Barnard said that, in his letter to Mr. Robinson he had asked Mr. Robinson to explain what would be accomplished by having a meeting with the University now, given that he had decided not to do so when he had the option to call a meeting prior to the release of the Report, as provided for in CAUT procedures. He said he would be open to a meeting if he receives a response to that question.

Dean Taylor said he has been seized with issues in the Department of Economics since he was appointed as the Dean of Arts in 2011 and indicated he is continuing to work on the issue. He recalled that, at the February Senate meeting, he had indicated that a search for the headship of the Department was ongoing. He indicated that that process is still ongoing and that he is considering a recommendation received from the search committee. He said that, once that

process is complete, he will continue to work on the issue with either the current head, should that individual be reappointed, or a new head.

Professor Kettner expressed his appreciation that Senate had an opportunity to participate in a discussion of the issues surrounding the CAUT Report and the President's statement on that Report, as the issues raised are of interest to all members of the University and not only to those in the Department who are directly affected. He said he found many aspects of the matter troubling, including a sense, initially, that he should try to decide which of the two polarized views he should support. He said there are things in each document that he could support, but there are also things in both documents that he is not comfortable with, including some of the language used. He said he was concerned that a characterization of the CAUT Report as being "inherently flawed" suggests that there is nothing in it worthy of consideration, although that might not have been the intent. Use of extreme statements such as "the toxic tyranny of the majority," in the CAUT Report, is also troubling even though extreme positions can sometimes be correct. Professor Kettner observed that the University encourages students not to approach complex problems as though there might be one right interpretation of the facts. He expressed his hope that, in the discussion and resolution of matters in the Department of Economics, individuals will embrace heterodoxy in their thinking and their review of the facts, that they will engage and welcome facts, opinions, or opinions about facts before drawing conclusions, and that they would do so in a respectful manner, which an academic institution would, ideally, both create and expect.

Professor Calder read a statement from several members of the Department of Economics, namely Professors Loxley, Hudson, Serieux, Chernomas, Sepehri, and Baragar, on the University reaction to the CAUT Report. In the statement, these members of the Department are critical of the President's response to the CAUT Report, which, they contend, minimizes and diverts attention from the serious problems that exist in the Department, and they call upon the President and the University community to address the serious problems in the Department. The statement details problems and events that have occurred in the Department that have, in their view, involved a marginalization of heterodox scholars in the unit. These include, but are not limited to, curriculum changes that have reduced the heterodox content of the curriculum following an external program review conducted by reviewers not sympathetic to the heterodox approach, inequitable treatment of heterodox faculty and their graduate students, a deterioration of collegiality within the department by ignoring heterodox interests in departmental events and activities, and the failure to initiate a new hiring search for a heterodox economist following a search that had been cancelled by Dean Sigurdson more than a decade ago.

President Barnard replied that he would leave it to Senators to read comments he made when the CAUT investigation was announced, so they might decide for themselves that was intended.

Mr. Thapa raised concerns regarding the credibility of the CAUT Report given the use of anonymous witnesses' testimony, some of who have made serious allegations about events that are alleged to have occurred and against particular individuals in the Department of Economics, including the Head. He noted that

those anonymous students who had approached the CAUT investigators could bring their concerns, in confidence, to either the Arts Student Body Council or the UMSU Council. Mr. Thapa said the University cannot allow the CAUT to dictate how it should address matters in the Department of Economics, as doing so would undermine governance processes of the Department and the Faculty that have been approved by the Faculty Council and Senate.

Observing that the details of the CAUT Report are best discussed elsewhere, Professor Chen suggested that what is of concern to Senate are matters of collegial governance and the University's values that are identified in the Strategic Plan. She suggested that it would be crucial to think about the role of leadership in the collegial governance process, particularly given that budget cuts might lead to other difficult discussions in other units regarding the diversity of programs. The discussion should take into account the role of leadership at all levels, from the Department and Faculty up to senior Administration and the President, particularly in situations where the collegial governance process fails to resolve certain conflicts or decisions. Ideally, the collegial governance model allows the academy to make decisions and resolve conflicts but there are sometimes circumstances in which this does not occur. Professor Chen suggested that, in such instances, it is crucial that leadership takes a role in finding a resolution but contended that all members of the academy bear responsibility for working together to reach a resolution. Professor Chen suggested that the way in which individuals in the Department of Economics and University leadership will deal with the present difficulties in the Department might model how future problems requiring difficult conversations might be addressed.

President Barnard agreed that the questions Professor Chen had raised, regarding how governing processes should work and whether there are boundary conditions that could be identified, are important ones to consider. He said that, what he had tried to convey in his statement, is that the President and others in leadership positions need to be hesitant about stepping into collegial governance processes in departments. If it does become necessary for leadership to intervene that should occur after all other processes have failed.

Professor Guard suggested that the refusal or hesitancy of various levels of Administration to intervene in matters in the Department of Economics have been selective. She contended that, where interventions had occurred, these had contributed in a significant way to reducing heterodox members to a minority within the Department.

Dean Turnbull concurred with Professor Chen's observation that it is important, in the context of collegial governance, to recognize that every individual involved in the process is also a leader in that process. She observed that the process only works if every individual brings their best self to the process and engages in a fair and respectful discussion of a question. Dean Turnbull echoed Professor Kettner's observation that faculty model behaviour for students to engage in heterodox discussions and so it is important that members of the University community work in good faith to ensure that conversations at faculty councils are respectful. Dean Turnbull said she would share the President's hesitancy to look for outside interventions that would disrupt an internal departmental process that

is already underway. She contended that it is important for academic leaders to leave space for colleagues to govern themselves collegially, with allowance for a diversity of views.

Professor Booth remarked that, when Senate had recommended the Strategic Plan to the Board of Governors (November 5, 2014), it almost did not enshrine collegiality as an institutional value. He suggested that the CAUT Report has revealed that there is a problem with respect to collegial governance and collegiality, which raises the question of what the University means by collegiality.

President Barnard thanked Senators for their candor and directness in the discussion of a difficult issue. He reiterated that it is his sense that it is not only one component of the Department of Economics that feels aggrieved. Observing that the Dean of Arts has indicated that he is seized with the issue and given that there is a headship search underway he indicated that he would be hesitant to intervene at this point in time. He noted that it is also not Senate's role to involve itself with the details of this departmental matter. President Barnard said he would determine what the next steps should be once Dean Taylor has advised him of the results of the headship search.

President Barnard invited members to continue to share their advice on the matter with him outside of the meeting. He said it is important that the matter be resolved and that he had hoped that it was not necessary to see a polarization in the Department, and that the labels "heterodox" and "orthodox" could be viewed as components of a larger whole rather than as two incompatible things.

XI ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:42 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 15, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 72, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on April 1, 2015.