

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. C. Anderson
Prof. G. Anderson
Prof. John
Anderson
Prof. Judith
Anderson
Prof. B. Austin-Smith
Dean S. Baum
Dean J. Beddoes
Dean M. Benarroch
Prof. R. Bhullar
Prof. T. Booth
Prof. O. Botar
Prof. M. Brabston
Dean. D. Brown
Prof. M. Campbell
Prof. J. Carlberg
Prof. P. Cattini
Prof. T. Chen
Prof. M. Cheung
Prof. D. Churchill
Prof. N. Cicek
Acting Dean,
D. Collins
Prof. R. Currie
Prof. P. Dass
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. R. Desai
Dean J. Doering
Prof. M. Domaratzki
Ms. A. Ducas
Prof. B. Elias
Prof. T. Falkenberg
Prof. A. Farenhorst
Prof. G. Fitzell
Ms. M. Furgale
Prof. M. Gabbert
Prof. G. Giesbrecht
Ms. S. Gottheil
Dean N. Halden
Dean G. Hepburn

Prof. P. Hess
Prof. J. Honeyford
Prof. J. Hughes
Mr. R. Ilag
Ms. M. Ishida
Ms. L. Johnson
Ms. M.-A. Kandrack
Mr. J. Kearsey
Dr. J. Keselman
Ms. A. Kilgour
Mr. P. Kochan
Prof. R. Koop
Mr. J. Kopp
Prof. L. Landrum
Mr. J. Lieberman
Ms. H. Loewen
Prof. D. MacPherson
Prof. S. McClement
Mr. B. McMechan
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. A. McNicol
Mr. B. Mahatoo
Dean D. Mandzuk
Ms. K. Marcynuk
Prof. A. Menkis
Dean J. Mulvale
Dean B. O'Connell
Prof. D. Oliver
Prof. W. Oxford
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dean B. Postl
Ms. A. Prychitko
Ms. C. Reitano
Prof. G. Restall
Mr. C. Rivera
Ms. A. Robert
Ms. A. Roscoe
Prof. A. Schultz
Prof. A. Schwann
Prof. B. Shay
Mr. R. Sherbo
Ms. G. Sidhu
Mr. G. Sobie
Ms. S. Tappia
Dean J. Taylor
Ms. H. Teklemariam

Prof. C. Trott
Ms. R. van Ginkel
Dean K. Wittenberg
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,
Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. J. Adams
Dr. D. Collins
Mr. S. Dorge
Dr. G. Glavin
Prof. D.
Hiebert-Murphy
Ms. R. Kunzman
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. K. Matheos
Dr. J. Ristock
Prof. G. Smith
Dr. D. Stewart
Dr. M. Torchia

Regrets

Prof. R. Biscontri
Prof. P. Blunden
Prof. F. Burczynski
Recteur G. Csepregi
Dr. G. Farthing
Prof. D. Funk
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Prof. R. Hechter
Prof. P. Hultin
Dean A. Iacopino
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. W. Kinsner
Prof. S. Logsetty
Ms. J. McConnell
Ms. K. Metcalfe
Mr. H. Piyadasa
Prof. M. Rastegar
Dr. H. Sector
Prof. H. Singh

Prof. R. Tate
Prof. D. Walker
Ms. D. Young

Absent

Mr. J. Arcega
Ms. P. Bachewich
Mr. M. Bourrier
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. J. Cranston
Dean N. Davies
Prof. M. Hudson
Ms. T. McVannel
Ms. M. Maduka
Mr. K. Mann
Mr. S. O'Connor
Ms. C. Plumton
Ms. E. Popowich
Dr. M.-J. Romaniuk
Mr. S. Sinclair
Prof. D. Smyth
Dean L. Turnbull
Prof. B.-C. Wang
Mr. Q. Watt

Also Present

Ms. O. Alaka
Ms. S. Bannatyne
Ms. K. Batchelo
Ms. R. Caruso
Mr. T. Chakraborty
Ms. A. Domingo
Mr. A. Fenwick
Ms. G. Gordon
Ms. D. Hallock
Ms. M. Jansen
Ms. S. Kunwar
Prof. M. McKay
Ms. K. Paineau
Ms. B. Parker
Mr. A. Reis
Mr. J. Sanderson
Ms. E. Stone
Mr. A. Thapa

Also Present
(continued)

Prof. K. Thiessen
Ms. S. Utsunomiya
Ms. M. Watson

The Chair informed Senate that the Speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Paul Hess, School of Art.

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

1. Reports of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes

(a) RE: Departments of Classics, Biochemistry and Medical Genetics, and Physical Therapy [November 18, 2015] Page 4

(b) RE: Department of Human Anatomy and Cell Science [November 18, 2015] Page 7

Professor Hess MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve the the Reports of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes regarding the Departments of Classics, Biochemistry and Medical Genetics, and Physical Therapy [November 18, 2015] and the Department of Human Anatomy and Cell Science [November 18, 2015].

CARRIED

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part A [November 10, 2015] Page 9

2. In Memoriam: Dr. Guenter Rudolf Krause Page 18

Dean Baum offered a memorial tribute to Dr. Guenter Krause, who joined the Department of Mathematics (then the Department of Mathematics and Astronomy) at the University of Manitoba in 1969 and who served, at various times, as Associate Head, Acting Head, and Head of the Department. Dr. Krause was an accomplished researcher whose work was continuously supported by NSERC grants throughout a research career that spanned more than forty years.

3. Items Approved by the Board of Governors [November 24, 2015] Page 19

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Dr. Barnard welcomed Senators back following the Winter Holiday.

Dr. Barnard informed Senators that the *Budget and Planning Book* was available on the Budget and Planning website. He said the document is a useful resource for information on the University's finances and planning.

V QUESTION PERIOD

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

No questions were received.

VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 2, 2015

Professor Brabston MOVED, seconded by Dean Mandzuk, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on December 2, 2015 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 [October 30, 2015]** Page 20

Senate received, for information, *Editorial Changes to the Report from the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes on Course and Program Changes* [dated October 30, 2015].

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

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 21

Professor Hess said the Executive Committee met on December 9, 2015. Comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they are made.

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

Ms. Ducas reported that the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee had concluded all of its business before the Winter Holiday.

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

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [November 10, 2015]** Page 22

Professor McMillan MOVED, seconded by Dean Benarroch, THAT Senate recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [dated November 10, 2015].

CARRIED

2. **Proposal for a Bachelor of Midwifery, College of Nursing, University of Manitoba, and Faculty of Health, University College of the North**

Page 27

Dean O'Connell said that, in November 2013, the former Council on Post-Secondary Education (COPSE) had asked that the University of Manitoba (U of M) and the University College of the North (UCN) partner to develop options for delivering the Bachelor of Midwifery (B.Mid.) program, to ensure that the program would meet provincial requirements for the supply of registered midwives. The Council had further requested that the two universities acknowledge the importance of maintaining a strong northern and Indigenous focus within the program. A steering committee with representatives from the Colleges of Nursing and Medicine (U of M), UCN, the College of Midwives of Manitoba, the Ministry of Education and Advanced Learning, Advanced Learning Division, and an Indigenous Elder had met to provide input on the program. Dean O'Connell said the proposal for the B.Mid. reflects wide consultation with faculty from both universities, with colleagues nationally and internationally, and with Indigenous Elders. The College of Midwives of Manitoba, which is the professional regulatory body, has approved the proposed program.

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

Page 187

Professor Smith referred Senators to the observations in the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes (SCCCC). He said the committee had endorsed the proposal for a B.Mid. program.

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

Page 190

Ms. Ducas called attention to several observations in the Report of the SPPC. She said the committee had noted that, because two courses required for admission to the B.Mid. program (BIOL 1410 and BIOL 1412) are already oversubscribed, it might be necessary to make additional funds available to the Faculty of Science for service teaching if the program were to be implemented. Ms. Ducas said the total cost of delivering the program would be \$1,819,206 in Year 4. A request for \$1,693,161 in new resources would be submitted to the province to cover a portion of this cost. Assuming an annual intake of twelve students, 50 percent of tuition fees would generate an additional \$126,134 in revenue. Ms. Ducas said the College of Nursing has sufficient capital facilities, including equipment recently moved from UCN, to support the program. The Faculty of Health, UCN, also has sufficient instructional and administrative space for the initial years of the program.

Ms. Ducas noted that the SPPC had not made a recommendation on the priority level that would be assigned to the program proposal, as the proposal responds to a request from the province, which has identified the program as a priority.

- c) **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 193

Ms. Gottheil said the Senate Committee on Admissions had noted that the admission requirements proposed for the B.Mid. program are the same as those for the Bachelor of Nursing program. She said the committee supports the proposal.

- d) **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation** Page 194

Dr. Ristock reported that the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation (SCIE) supports the proposal for a B.Mid. program. She said the academic regulations for the program would parallel existing regulations for the Bachelor of Nursing program, with a few exceptions. The committee had agreed that this would facilitate the administration of the program by the Director and the Associate Dean (Undergraduate Programs). Dr. Ristock said the U of M would be responsible for student records. Administration of academic regulations concerning student progression would be the responsibility a joint subcommittee of the College of Nursing Academic Progress Committee. Student advisors at both institutions would have access to student records so they could properly advise students.

Dean Bev O’Connell MOVED, THAT Senate approve, and recommend that the Board of Governors approve, a proposal for a Bachelor of Midwifery program, to be offered jointly by the College of Nursing, University of Manitoba, and the Faculty of Health, University College of the North.

CARRIED

Dr. Barnard thanked those who were involved in developing the proposal.

3. Revised Academic Regulations, Faculty of Science

- a) **RE: B.Sc.(Major) Degree Graduation Requirements**

- (i) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 197

Professor Smith said the SCCCC had endorsed changes to the B.Sc.(Major) Degree Graduation Requirements proposed by the Faculty of Science.

- (ii) **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation** Page 198

Dr. Ristock said SCIE had endorsed a proposed change to the general B.Sc.(Major) Degree Graduation Requirements, which would standardize the Grade Point Average calculation used to assess students’ eligibility for graduation. She said the Faculty of Science is proposing that a minimum Degree Grade Point Average of 2.0 be required. Currently

students are assessed for graduation based on a requirement for a minimum Grade Point Average of 2.0 on the 120 credit hours that contribute to the degree.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committees, THAT Senate approved the Reports of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes and the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revised Graduation Requirements for the B.Sc.(Major) programs, Faculty of Science, effective September 1, 2016.

CARRIED

b) RE: B.Sc.(Honours) Degree Entrance, Continuation, and Graduation Requirements

(i) Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes Page 201

Professor Smith said proposed revisions to the B.Sc.(Hons.) Degree Entrance Requirements would (i) clarify that the Entrance Requirements for the B.Sc.(Hons.) in Psychology differ from those for all other B.Sc.(Hons.) programs in that a minimum Degree Grade Point Average of 3.5, rather than 3.0, is required and (ii) specify that entrance to a B.Sc.(Hons.) degree requires a grade of “B” or better in at least one course designated by the department(s), rather than in at least one introductory course specified by the department(s), as currently stipulated. The latter revision would bring the general regulation into line with the way in which curricula and entrance requirements for various B.Sc.(Hons.) programs have evolved over time.

Professor Smith said the proposed amendment to the general B.Sc.(Hons.) Continuation Requirements would clarify that the existing Continuation Requirements for the B.Sc.(Hons.) in Psychology differ from those for other B.Sc.(Hons.) program in that a minimum Degree Grade Point Average of 3.5, rather than 3.0, is required to continue in the program.

(ii) Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation Page 203

Dr. Ristock said SCIE had endorsed proposed changes to the B.Sc.(Hons.) Degree Entrance, Continuation, and Graduation Requirements.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committees, THAT Senate approved the Reports of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes and the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revised Entrance, Continuation, and Graduation Requirements for the B.Sc.(Honours) programs, Faculty of Science, effective September 1, 2016.

CARRIED

4. **Reports of the Senate Committee on Admissions**

- a) **RE: Proposal for a Diversity Admission Policy for the B.Ed. Program, Faculty of Education** Page 208

Ms. Gottheil said the Faculty of Education was proposing to establish a *Diversity Admission* policy, for the B.Ed. program. The policy would replace the existing Special Consideration Category for admission, which allows for up to ten percent of the admission intake to be admitted under this category and addresses issues of underrepresentation of traditionally disadvantaged groups. The proposed policy would provide for up to forty-five percent of all available positions, in each of the Early, Middle, and Senior Years Streams, to be awarded, on the basis of the highest admission scores, to applicants who have self-identified by their application through one or more of the five diversity categories set out in the proposal. In any given year that there were not a sufficient number of applicants under any of the various diversity categories, spaces would be opened up for general admission.

- (i) **Comments of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 222

Professor Hess said that, at its meeting on December 9, 2015, Senate Executive had endorsed a proposal from the Faculty of Education to establish a *Diversity Admission* policy for the Bachelor of Education program, with the *proviso* that, in the first three years following the implementation of the policy, the Faculty forward the annual report of the Committee on Initial Teacher Education Programs on the implications of the policy to the Senate Committee on Admissions.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal for a *Diversity Admission* Policy, for the Bachelor of Education program, Faculty of Education, effective for the September 2017 intake, with a *proviso* that, in the first three years following the implementation of the policy, the Faculty forward the annual report of the Committee on Initial Teacher Education Program, on the implications of the policy, to the Senate Committee on Admissions, for its review.

In response to a question, Dean Mandzuk said 400 to 450 students are admitted to the B.Ed. program annually.

CARRIED

- b) **RE: Revised Admission Requirements for the B.Ed. Program, Université de Saint-Boniface** Page 223

Ms. Gottheil said the Université de Saint-Boniface was proposing two changes to the admission requirements for the Bachelor of Education program. A proposal to expand the list of teachable subjects for the B.Ed. program to include Religious Studies is consistent with a proposal from

the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, previously approved by Senate (October 7, 2015). A second proposal to modify the requirement for history or geography would enhance students' ability to transfer into the B.Ed. program from other institutions.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning revised admission requirements for the Bachelor of Education program, Université de Saint-Boniface, effective on approval by Senate.

CARRIED

c) RE: Revised Admission Process for Sequential High School Students, Enrolment Services

Page 231

Ms. Gottheil said "sequential high school students" refers to students admitted to the University directly from high school. She said that, in order to enhance the student experience and to better manage admission to the University's programs, Enrolment Services was proposing that offers of admission be made on the basis of interim grade 12 results. Currently, admission offers are made in late July after the University receives final grade 12 results from the high schools. This is not competitive with other places that make earlier admission offers based on interim grade 12 results. Ms. Gottheil said thirty-seven of thirty-nine institutions that replied to a survey base offers of admission on preliminary grades.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from Enrolment Services for a revised admission process for sequential high school students, effective for the September 2017 intake.

In response to a question, Ms. Gottheil said entrance scholarship offers would continue to be based on applicants' interim grades. The scholarship offers would be made at the same time as conditional offers of admission, so applicants would have all of the information required to make a decision regarding their offer of admission. In response to a follow-up question, Mr. Adams said Admissions would review applicants' final grade 12 results, to ensure that they continue to meet the admission requirements, but entrance scholarship offers would not be rescinded even where an applicant's final grades did not meet the minimum award requirements.

CARRIED

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

a) **RE: Revised Academic Regulations, B.Ed. Program, Faculty of Education**

(i) **Academic Standing** Page 239

Dr. Ristock said the Faculty of Education was proposing changes to the wording of the Academic Regulation concerning Academic Standing in the Bachelor of Education program. A note would be added to the grading scale to indicate that practicum courses are graded on a pass/fail basis and that either a minimum grade of “C” or a pass (P) is required for all B.Ed. courses in order for a student to maintain clear standing in the program.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revised Academic Regulations regarding Academic Standing, for the Bachelor of Education, Faculty of Education, effective September 1, 2016.

CARRIED

(ii) **Repeating a Course** Page 242

Dr. Ristock said the Faculty was also proposing changes to the Academic Regulation concerning Repeating a Course, for the B.Ed. program. The regulation stipulates that education courses can be repeated only once. The revised regulation would add information concerning practicum courses and would specify that a student who obtains an “F” grade in any three of the four practicum courses would be required to withdraw from the program. Under the revised regulation, students would have up to nine attempts to successfully complete the four required practicum courses.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revised Academic Regulations related to Repeating a Course, for the Bachelor of Education, Faculty of Education, effective September 1, 2016.

CARRIED

b) **RE: Regulation concerning NURS 4560 Professional Foundations 7: Preparation for Nursing Practice 7, Bachelor of Nursing Degree, College of Nursing** Page 246

Dr. Ristock said the College of Nursing was proposing a new Academic Regulation for the Bachelor of Nursing program regarding the course NURS 4560 – Professional Foundations 7: Preparation for Nursing Practice 7. NURS 4560 prepares students for the final senior practicum course, when students engage in 450 hours of clinical practice. The new

regulation would specify that students who withdraw from or fail (i) any Year 4 Term 2 course or (ii) NURS 4580 – Nursing Practice 7 would normally be required to complete NURS 4560 again, even if the student had successfully completed the course previously. Dr. Ristock said the rationale for the regulation is, first, that nursing courses are sequenced and build on information from earlier courses and, second, that students attempting NURS 4580 for a second time would require a different set of preparatory knowledge and skills, as they would complete the course at a new clinical site.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning NURS 4560 Professional Foundations 7: Preparation for Nursing Practice, for the Bachelor of Nursing, College of Nursing, effective September 1, 2016.

CARRIED

c)	RE: Proposed Revisions to Withdrawal Policies and Associated Changes	Page 250
	(i) <u>Revised Voluntary Withdrawal Policy</u>	Page 269
	(ii) <u>Authorized Withdrawal Policy and Procedure</u>	Page 274
	(iii) <u>Repeated Course Policy</u>	Page 282
	(iv) <u>Revised Grade Point Averages Policy</u>	Page 286

Dr. Ristock said SCIE had endorsed a revised *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy, a proposed policy and procedure on *Authorized Withdrawal*, which had been extracted from that, a new *Repeated Course* policy, and a revised *Grade Point Averages* policy. The purpose of the new and revised policies and procedures is to change how some students use voluntary withdrawals (VWs) and course repeats, to address negative impacts that arise, including, among others noted in observation 4 of the committee’s Report, bottlenecks in some required and prerequisite courses, high rates of degree non-completion, and inequity for students who opt not to VW. Dr. Ristock said the University of Manitoba experiences much larger numbers of VWs and course repeats than other institutions. In the last five years, VWs averaged 17,445 per year (primarily involving 1000- and 2000- level courses) and course repeats averaged 14,188 per year.

Dr. Ristock referred the committee to a background document prepared by Dr. Collins Vice-Provost (Integrated Planning and Academic Programs) for detailed rationales for the various changes proposed. She said the mandate of a review committee, which had been struck several years ago to review the *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy, had been expanded when it was realized that it would also be necessary to revise several related policies in order to resolve high rates of VWs and course repeats. The review committee had consulted with various bodies regarding the

proposed changes, including the Associate Deans Undergraduate, Provost's Council, and the Advising Council.

Dr. Ristock highlighted a number of significant changes to the policies. First, rather than defining a limit on the number of VWs a student could accumulate, the revised policies would introduce the notion of Limited Access, which would be key to addressing issues arising from large numbers of VWs and course repeats. Second, a separate policy and procedure on *Authorized Withdrawal* would be created to clarify that Authorized Withdrawals (AWs) are different than VWs and to clarify that AWs are intended to be used only when a student has experienced a serious illness or has encountered extraordinary personal circumstances. Third, the *Repeated Course* policy would allow faculties, colleges, and schools to establish limits on the number of course repeats a student could incur in their program. Finally, the revised *Grade Point Average* policy would include a more comprehensive description of Grade Point Average and would require a non-selective Grade Point Average calculation that would take into account all course attempts, to better reflect students' academic efforts.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revisions to the *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy, the *Authorized Withdrawal* policy and procedure, the *Grade Point Averages* policy, and the introduction of a *Repeated Course* policy, effective September 1, 2016.

Professor McPherson raised a concern that Part V, section 5.2 (a), in each of the various policies, communicates that the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) could unilaterally review, revise, or appeal these policies. Dr. Ristock confirmed that any future revisions to the policies would require Senate's approval. She said the wording used in the section noted is standard wording in the Policy Format Template for governing documents at the University. The Office of the University Secretary will consult with the Office of Legal Counsel to determine whether the standard wording in the template requires revision.

Mr. Kopp raised a concern regarding the lack of consultation with students on proposed revisions to the *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy and associated changes. He remarked that students have been engaged throughout the process, in ongoing discussions to revise various behavioural policies, including the *Respectful Work and Learning Environment* policy.

Mr. Kopp said he would have concerns regarding a provision for Limited Access, in the *Repeated Course* policy, unless safeguards could be implemented to ensure that students who voluntarily withdraw for legitimate reasons would not be adversely affected. He also raised a concern that University of Manitoba students seeking admission to competitive entry programs could be disadvantaged if the proposed changes were to lead to lower Grade Point Averages that were not

competitive with those of graduating from other institutions with fewer restrictions on VWs and course repeats. He suggested that the proposal should include comparative analysis of policies at other U15 universities and some analysis of how the revised policies might impact University of Manitoba students applying to professional programs.

Mr. Kopp acknowledged that the issues that the revised set of policy documents are intended to address are real, but he raised concerns about some of the premises presented and conclusions reached by the review committee. Referring to the review committee's position that reducing VWs and course repeats would lead to reduced student debt, Mr. Kopp said this had not been demonstrated. Moreover, students had not been consulted on whether their preference would be to have less student debt or to continue to have access to uncontrolled VWs and course repeats, as the current *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy allows. Mr. Kopp suggested that the central premise for revising the *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy and related documents is the idea that students are abusing the system in order to inflate their Grade Point Averages. Counter to the conclusion of the review committee, he suggested that the data presented in the proposal do not support this premise, as they show that students with lower Grade Point Averages use VWs at higher ratios than students with higher Grade Point Averages.

In order to ensure that the proposed changes would not adversely affect students, Mr. Kopp suggested that more information is required concerning, first, the student demographic that would be most affected and, second, the reasons why those students are electing to VW from various courses. Based on a student survey undertaken by UMSU, he reported that students withdraw for the following reasons: workload (70 percent), the instructor's teaching approach is incompatible with the student's learning style (30 percent), mental health reasons (33 percent), and external factors unrelated to the university environment (40 percent).

Dr. Collins stressed that neither he nor anyone on the review committee had asserted that students who use VWs to manage Grade Point Averages are abusing the system. He said the activity of taking VWs and repeating courses is allowed by the current policy. He said the review committee's view is that the policies, as they currently exist, are incorrect and, for this reason, the committee has been engaged in a review to correct the policies. He suggested that only the practice of enrolling in multiple courses with the intent to subsequently drop some might be viewed as an abuse of the *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy, as the practice denies other students access to those courses.

Dr. Collins acknowledged that a greater proportion of students admitted to the University with high school averages in the lower ranges utilize VWs relative to students admitted with averages in the higher ranges. He observed, however, that it is the much larger number of VWs, by students with strong Grade Point Averages, that is contributing to the high rate of VWs at the University.

Dr. Collins identified several issues that arise from the large number of VWs and course repeats. One is the negative impact on students who have not previously attempted the courses and who are prevented from enrolling in courses required for their programs. He noted that, increasingly, there are students who are caught in stasis, for a period of three or more years, as they cannot access required courses. A second issue is that the practice of repeating courses to manage Grade Point Averages inflates admission standards for professional programs. The same practice can lead to issues in the selection of recipients for student awards, as students who elect to use VWs to manage their Grade Point Averages would be advantaged over students who either elect not to or cannot afford to do so.

Dr. Collins remarked that the Limited Access provision is not new; it is an existing provision within the *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy that was approved by Senate in 1993 but was not implemented, as it could not be achieved through Aurora INB. A way has now been found to implement the Limited Access provision without tying up student advising resources. Dr. Collins noted that, over the last five years, course repeats have average 14,188 per year and, in 2014/2015, Student Advisors had completed 16,589 manual course overrides.

Dr. Collins acknowledged that students had not been formally consulted as part of the review. He noted that it has not been the norm to do so when changes to academic policies are being considered. He indicated that the review committee had engaged with students regarding the changes, in an informal way. Dr. Collins noted that, while student vacancies on SCIE had not been filled prior to that committee's initial discussion of the revised policies in September, student representatives did participate in the discussion at the committee in November. Also, information on how students are using VWs had been provided by students through a survey conducted by the Registrar's Office. Dr. Collins observed that what is lacking from the surveys conducted by the Registrar's Office and by UMSU is feedback from students who could not enroll in courses as a result of the high rates of VWs and course repeats at the University.

Professor Oliver recalled that, several years ago, changes to tuition fee remissions had made it more expensive for students to VW from courses. He asked whether that change had had an impact on the way that students use VWs. Dr. Collins replied that the number of VWs has continued to trend upward.

On the basis of discussions with students, at Student Senate Caucus and elsewhere, Ms. Kilgour said students recognize that there is a need to address current problems with the *Voluntary Withdrawal* and other policies that lead to inflation of Grade Point Averages, for admission to competitive entry programs, and bottlenecks in required and prerequisite courses. She raised a concern, however, that the Limited Access provision might delay graduation, rather than decrease time-to-completion, given the potential that students, who had withdrawn or

previously attempted a course, would be perpetually unable to reregister for prerequisite and required courses. She remarked that this possibility would have to be considered in the context of recent budget cuts that have resulted in the reduction of course sections for some courses, including some 1000- and 2000- level courses from which students frequently withdraw and which typically fill up before the end of Regular Registration Period.

Ms. Kilgour raised a concern that implementation of the Limited Access provision would disadvantage some student demographics more than others. First year students who initially sign up for a full course load and subsequently withdraw from a course(s) for legitimate reasons, for example, to manage workload or to deal with personal circumstances, might be negatively affected, as many of the courses from which they would withdraw are prerequisite courses. If these students were not able to reregister in these courses, it might delay their graduation. Also, the option to reregister for courses in the Summer Term, when the Limited Access provision would not apply, would not be open to students who work full-time or to international students who return home in the summer. Moreover, if implementation of the Limited Access provision were to lead to increased demand, there might not be sufficient spaces in courses offered in the Summer Term.

Ms. Kilgour observed that, while most U15 universities do not allow for unregulated VWs, policies concerning voluntary withdrawals and course repeats that are in place at other institutions are less restrictive than what has been proposed by the review committee. She said the University of Alberta, the University of British Columbia, the University of Calgary, McGill University, and the University of Waterloo all use a variation of the Limited Access provision, but generally allow for one course repeat, where students have previously withdrawn from or failed a course.

Ms. Kilgour proposed two options for amending the Limited Access provision. The objective of the proposed modifications would be to ensure that students could complete their programs in a timely way. The first option would be to allow the opportunity for one course repeat, where a student had either withdrawn from or failed any course or had not achieved a sufficient grade in a prerequisite course, before enforcing the Limited Access provision. She suggested that the proposed modification would address the issue of students repeating courses multiple times to achieve a higher grade but would allow students required to withdraw or to repeat a course, for legitimate reasons, an opportunity to reregister. Ms. Kilgour said the Registrar's Office had indicated that enforcement of a one-repeat rule could not be managed in Aurora INB, but she contended that the limits of the student information system should not dictate the policy. The second option would be to limit the amount of time that the Limited Access provision would be applied; for example, a student who withdrew from, or had previously completed a course might be restricted from reregistering in that course for one year after which time the Limited Access restriction would be removed. Ms. Kilgour said implementation of the second option would require manual interventions by Student

Advisors. She suggested that staff would not be overwhelmed by this work, as the number of course overrides that would be required would be reduced because students would not be repeating courses multiple times to improve their Grade Point Averages.

Ms. Kilgour proposed that further discussion of the revised *Voluntary Withdrawal* and related policies be deferred to the next meeting, so consideration might be given to the feasibility of the two options proposed. She acknowledged the importance of having revised policies in place for the Fall 2016, with time to communicate the changes to students before then, but suggested that it would also be important to ensure that the changes would not negatively impact students.

Ms. Kilgour MOVED, seconded by Professor Booth, THAT Senate refer revisions to the *Voluntary Withdrawal* policy, the *Authorized Withdrawal* policy and procedure, the *Grade Point Averages* policy, and the introduction of a *Repeated Course* policy back to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation for further consideration.

Professor Brabston said she would not support the motion to refer the documents back to SCIE. She indicated that she would support a motion to approve the Report from SCIE, with the proposed modification to the Limited Access provision, to allow for one course repeat. She noted the imperative to have revised policies in place by the Fall 2016.

The Chair asked if there were a critical deadline that would not be met if the revised policies were referred back to SCIE. Dr. Ristock said the objective is to have revised policies in place for September 2016.

Dr. Collins said it is not anticipated that the Limited Access provision would negatively impact students' ability to reregister in courses, as proposed changes to the set of policies included with the Report of SCIE would eliminate the incentive for students to repeat courses to manage their Grade Point Averages. This, in turn, would open up spaces in courses that are currently oversubscribed. Dr. Collins said the University would monitor the impact of the revised policies on students and any negative impacts would be addressed in future revisions to the policies and procedures.

Dr. Keselman acknowledged the concerns raised by students. She reminded the committee, however, that the constellation of new and revised policies would introduce changes that are intended to balance various concerns expressed by students, including concerns from students who cannot register in courses for the first time, in addition to those who would be concerned that the Limited Access provision would restrict their ability to register for a course for a second, third, or fourth time.

Dr. Keselman said that, while other institutions might not employ limited access, some do restrict the number of VWs or course repeats. The number of VWs and course repeats would continue to be unrestricted at

the U of M under the revised policies. She suggested that, if the University were going to consider limited access policies at other places, it would also be necessary to review how those places deal with VWs and repeated courses.

Professor Kandrack said she would support the motion to refer revisions to the *Voluntary Withdrawal* and other policies back to SCIE. Given that the potential impacts of the changes would be highly consequential for students, she said it is important that Senate is fully aware of what these would be. She said she had not been convinced that it would be imperative to have the revised policies in place by the Fall 2016.

Regarding concerns that had been raised regarding the potentially negative impact on students who withdraw from courses in their first year, Professor Chen observed that Senate Executive had been advised that the registration process currently gives priority to first year students, based on their high school admission average, followed by returning students in descending order based on their Grade Point Average. The proposed changes, which would give priority to students registering for courses for the first time during the Initial Registration Period before opening up registrations to all students, would have a nil effect on students in question, as they would not have first opportunity at registration under either scenario.

Professor Desai suggested that, if implementation of the revised *Grade Point Averages* policy would resolve the high rates of VWs by removing the incentive for students to repeat courses to improve their grades, it might not be necessary to implement the Limited Access provision. Following on from this, Professor Chen raised the possibility of returning only the Repeated Course policy to SCIE for further consideration of the Limited Access provision and advancing the other documents to Senate for implementation in the Fall. She observed that, even if the Repeated Course policy and the Limited Access provision were approved and implemented for the Fall, they would not have been put into effect before 2017.

The Chair noted that the 45 minutes allotted for discussion of item IX(5)(c) had elapsed.

Professor Austin-Smith MOVED, seconded by Professor Giesbrecht, THAT debate of item IX(5)(c) be extended for twenty minutes.

CARRIED

In response to a question, Dr. Collins suggested that it would be possible to amend the set of revised policies and procedures, to remove the Limited Access provision and all references to it, in time to be included on the February Senate agenda.

A vote was called on the motion to refer the Report back to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation.

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

Professor Gabbert MOVED, seconded by Professor Booth, THAT the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning Revisions to Withdrawal Policies and Associated Changes be referred back to Senate Executive, with the understanding that (i) proponents of the policy revisions would remove the provision for Limited Access from the documents, for consideration at the February Senate meeting, and (ii) that there would be further discussion of the Limited Access provision.

Dr. Collins committed to consulting with students during the discussions of the Limited Access provision.

CARRIED

X **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS** - none

XI **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 18, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 290, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on January 6, 2016.