

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 and Room A207 Chown Building

Members Present

Dr. M. Benarroch,
Chair
Prof. A. Abra
Dr. C. Adams
Ms. A. Allan
Ms. N. Andrew
Prof. J. Arino
Prof. L. Balneaves
Prof. M. Bertone
Prof. W. Bonness
Dean D. Brown
Prof. S. Bruce
Prof. A. Bunt
Prof. J. Chen
Prof. A. Chudyk
Prof. D. Churchill
Prof. N. Cicek
Prof. S. Clark
Prof. A. Clay
Ms. E. Cromarty
Prof. J. Detwiler
Ms. O. Dingwall
Prof. M. Docker
Dean P. Donahue
Prof. A. Doshi
Ms. M. Dumontet
Dean N. Dyck
Prof. P. Eck
Prof. P. Ferguson
Prof. S. Ferris
Prof. C. Figley
Acting Dean A.
Fredericksen
Dean M. Friesen
Ms. F. Ganiyu
Prof. N. Greidanus
Ms. J. Groisman
Prof. M. Hart
Dr. D. Hiebert-Murphy
Prof. M. Hudson
Ms. J. Ji
Dean R. Jochelson
Dean U. Kothe
Dean M. Locher

Prof. N. MacLeod

Schroeder
Dean K. Main
Dean B. Mark
Ms. S. Marks
Prof. D. Martin
Dean H. Marx
Prof. C. Miller
Ms. L. O'Hara
Prof. D. Oliver
Prof. J. Patzer
Dr. M. Pinto
Prof. S. Prentice
Prof. A. Raouf
Ms. H. Ritter
Prof. K. Rochon
Prof. B. Rose-Lovett
Prof. A. Saleem
Dean M. Scanlon
Ms. A. Sharma
Ms. D. Sharma
Ms. C. Shaw
Prof. M. Shaw
Ms. B. Siem
Ms. R. Smith
Mr. G. Sobie
Prof. R. Souleymanov
Prof. V. Sparks
Dean J. Stewart
Prof. A. Stewart-
Tufescu
Prof. V. Swain
Prof. K. Szilagyi
Prof. S. Teetzel
Prof. E. Thomson
Ms. J. Ticknor
Prof. G. Tranmer
Prof. D. Walker
Prof. BC Wang
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
S. Coyston,
Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. J. Adams
Dr. T. Chen
Ms. R. Dhaliwal
Dr. T. Duhamel
Prof. A. Farenhorst
Prof. K. Kumar
Mr. C. Perron
Dr. T. Peter
Dr. G. Smith
Prof. J. Tichon
Dr. M. Torchia
Prof. H-J Wieden

Regrets

Mr. S. Batla
Prof. R. Biscontri
Rectrice S. Bouffard
Ms. A. Bruce
Prof. M. Campbell
Ms. C. Cyr
Ms. L. Deane
Prof. J. Gamble
Prof. M. Garcia-
Holguera
Ms. S. Han
Prof. T. Ivanco
Ms. M. Kalaw-Crevier
Prof. S. Kirkland
Ms. V. Koldingnes
Prof. M. Kramer
Prof. T. Lakowski
Prof. D. Lobb
Chancellor A. Mahon
Prof. M. McKenzie
Prof. J. Peeler
Ms. L. Schnarr
Dean B. Silvestre
Prof. G. Thompson
Dean R. Urbanowski
Ms. V. Wainikka
Mx. C. Yendt

Absent

Prof. M. Anderson
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. C. Charles
Prof. R. Chernomas
Prof. S. Ciurysek
Prof. R. Coates
Mr. D. Dai
Prof. L. Delgado
Prof. S. Herath
Mr. C. Ives
Mr. O. Jakpa
Mr. G. Jhanji
Dean A. Kelekis-
Cholakis
Prof. S. Kuss
Ms. T. Lanre Hassan
Prof. F. Laurencelle
Prof. R.J. Leland
Prof. J. Mammei
Prof. H. Marzban
Dean P. Nickerson
Ms. A. Pham
Mr. C. Provost
Prof. M. Rafay
Mr. R. Shami
Ms. S. Sudhakar
Ms. S. Traskovksi
Ms. B. Usick
Acting Dean L.
Vercaigne
Prof. S. Webber

Also Present

Ms. C. Davidson
Dr. P. Dorrington
Ms. L. Orsak-Williams
Dr. K. Schwartz
Ms. M. Watson
Ms. M. Yoshida

The Chair informed Senate that the Speaker was Professor Jieying Chen, Asper School of Business.

I Matters to be Considered in Closed Session – none

II Matters Recommended for Concurrence without Debate

1. **Revisions to 2024-2025 Academic Schedule for the Max Rady College of Medicine** Page 4

Professor J. Chen MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve revisions to the 2024-2025 Academic Schedule for the Max Rady College of Medicine, effective upon Senate approval.

CARRIED

III Matters Forwarded for Information

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [November 12, 2024]** Page 7

2. **Correspondence from Provost and Vice-President (Academic) RE: Admission Target Increases, Health Sciences Programs - Provincial Approval**

- **Master of Nursing, Nurse Practitioner Program (Forty-Five Seats), College of Nursing** Page 18

- **Master of Occupational Therapy (Sixty Seats), College of Rehabilitation Sciences** Page 19

- **Master of Physical Therapy (Sixty Seats), College of Rehabilitation Sciences** Page 20

- **Master of Physician Assistant Studies (Fifteen Seats), Max Rady College of Medicine** Page 21

IV Report of the President

President Benarroch reported that the province received information from the federal government, on December 24th, on the number of provincial attestation letters (PALs) allocated to Manitoba for 2025. The University is waiting to receive information on how the PALs will be distributed among the various postsecondary institutions in the province. Different than the current year, international applicants to both undergraduate and graduate programs will require a PAL. President Benarroch anticipated the University of Manitoba might receive the bulk of the PALs allocated for international graduate students, because a significant proportion of the graduate students in the province are enrolled at the UM.

President Benarroch noted that the number of applications received to date from international applicants has decreased by 50 percent compared to the prior year. The University is continuing to work through the implications of this.

President Benarroch informed Senate that the University would present the 2025-2026 *Preliminary Estimates* submission to the Treasury Board on January 20th. He reminded Senators that the province has asked the University to plan for a 1.5 percent increase to the operating grant and a 3.5 percent increase for tuition. The province also asked the University to present on Indigenous enrolment and reconciliation and the institution's capital needs and requests.

President Benarroch said the day's UMToday news includes a statement from him indicating that the University will not make public statements on geopolitical events and current affairs but will follow an approach of institutional restraint. The intent is to allow for discussion and debate to happen institutionally among students and faculty without feeling constrained by the voice of the senior administration of the institution. President Benarroch acknowledged that a different approach has sometimes been taken in the past.

V Question Period

Senators are reminded that questions related to matters not on the agenda shall normally be submitted in writing to the University Secretary no later than 10:00 a.m. of the Monday preceding the meeting.

The following questions were received from Professor Tichon, University of Manitoba Faculty Association Assessor.

The University of Manitoba Act enumerates among Senate's powers specifically, in 34(1) q, the power to "make rules and regulations for the management and conduct of the libraries." This is because of the importance of the libraries to the entire university. To relocate from 20-50% of the library's print collection to a storage facility in another jurisdiction seems rather more than an administrative matter, but a matter of deep concern to many academic units and indeed the public of Manitoba. It deserves thorough consultation and approval, from Librarians' council, and also faculty councils, and Senate. The University Librarian's answer at December's Senate meeting left many matters poorly clarified.

1. What is the anticipated cost of a contract with the University of Calgary and for how long is that guaranteed to be the long term cost?
2. There is a vast difference between 20% and 50% of the UM Libraries print collection. What is the actual plan being negotiated with the University of Calgary? Has there been proper thought/consultation with academic units to determine which physical books and particular collections are most important to remain on-campus and what metrics are most important for decisions on what to move off-site?
3. One of the justifications for the move has been to create study space. Why not first complete a campus-wide student study place plan and proper weed of the collection, before moving the Library collection out of province?
4. Will the University commit to the Librarians' Council voting on a final proposal before proceeding any further with this proposal, and then

returning to Senate for further discussion, before any such contracts are signed?

Dr. Hiebert-Murphy prefaced her responses by acknowledging that academic libraries are undergoing a period of transformation as they look toward the future of academic libraries. It is not unique to the University of Manitoba. It is part of a part of a larger trend across all universities looking at how libraries can continue to support teaching research community engagement and student experience while transforming what they do and how they do it. One part of that transformation involves academic libraries reviewing their physical collections and how they can free up space for other uses. Recent research involved a survey of thirty-two libraries across various countries all of which are considering reducing their physical collections and the more common target is a 50 percent reduction. Dr. Hiebert-Murphy said the partnership being explored with the University of Calgary is similar to what is being done in other places in Canada, including in Ontario where nineteen universities are working collaboratively around collections and other library services.

Regarding the first question, Dr. Heibert-Murphy clarified that the two universities are exploring a partnership agreement. There would not be a contract. The partnership, which would not be a vendor-customer relationship, will benefit members of both institutions, who will have access to a larger collection. An additional benefit for the UM will be access to the University of Calgary's state-of-the-art high-density storage facilities. Any agreement will be developed in consultation with our Legal Counsel and will ensure that the UM's interests are protected, including that the costs are reasonable and manageable. The University of Manitoba will retain ownership of the collection and will continue to manage the metadata and records for the materials. There will be no inequity of access to materials in storage. Currently all members of the UM community and all Manitobans can access library materials, including electronic materials and materials in storage, and that will not change if materials are sent to the high-density library. Dr. Hiebert-Murphy reminded Senators that some library materials are already held in a local storage facility that is not a purposed facility. The associated costs are expensive, and the University incurs a charge each time an item is retrieved from storage.

Regarding the second question, Dr. Hiebert-Murphy said no decisions have been made regarding how many materials will be moved. It would depend on several factors, including the number of materials that have not been used within the last ten years, whether there is a duplicate item already available in the high-density library, and whether the UM has an electronic copy. A weeding project to identify and remove duplicate materials would be a first step before any materials would be sent to the high-density library. The preference is to avoid getting rid of materials that are not accessible in other ways. The preference would be a solution that allows us to store those materials in a fit for purpose facility that allows access should those materials be of interest to someone in the future. What the University is exploring is a sustainable way to that.

In response to the third question, Dr. Hiebert-Murphy said the University continually assesses space and space utilization across campus, including student space. The need for space for students is consistent with feedback received from students. There are significant space pressures, including for classroom spaces, and it has not been possible to repurpose many spaces to student study space. Libraries has worked with the Campus Planning Office to develop a space plan for the libraries. An external

functional space analysis was completed, and the University was found to be much below what is considered standard for library study spaces. The library also surveyed students and half indicated that they could not find space in the library and were not satisfied that the library space met their needs.

In response to the fourth question, Dr. Hiebert-Murphy said with respect to next steps, the management and storage of library collections are operational matters that are dealt with at the unit level. This is consistent with the manner in which operations have been carried out within the libraries. In developing a plan, there has been considerable consultation, including with the Senate Committee on Libraries, Deans and Directors Council, and including discussions among colleagues within the Libraries. Dr. Hiebert-Murphy invited Senators who have additional feedback that they would like considered as the discussions proceed, to share that with the University Librarian.

President Benarroch said roughly 130,000 items are in storage in two facilities in the city, which costs approximately \$87,000 annually plus additional fees to retrieve items. Between January 1, 2020 and January 1, 2025, the Libraries disposed of over 193,000 books, as part of a continuing process. The current situation is one that is not ideal, and the Libraries are looking for a way to both grow and maintain its collections in a way that is sustainable.

Referring to a response provided at this meeting and the meeting in December that the decision was an administrative or operational one, Professor Shaw countered that *The University of Manitoba Act* specifies that the Senate has authority for all academic matters. He suggested that before any agreement is signed with the University of Calgary, there is an obligation to have Senate approve the plan to store any materials off-site at that other institution.

Professor Tichon recognized that academic libraries across North American are evolving and reflecting on how books and other library resources are used. She contended that the University should engage in a conversation on this matter and make any decisions based on the institution's values. She echoed Professor Shaw's view that the decision was not an operational matter, as the Libraries have a significant impact on teaching and research activities and engagement with the University's communities. Faculty make pedagogical decisions based on resources available to them in the Libraries. These resources include not only books but maps and other tactile resources that are intended to be seen and serve as sources of ideas and information for students. Additionally, while some books have not been checked out in recent years, this does not necessarily mean students have not taken some of those books from the shelves as they reviewed materials to use to complete assignments. This practice would be more difficult if the books were transferred to a storage facility at the University of Calgary. Finally, people underserved in the community rely on the University Libraries, including the Law Library, to do research. Professor Tichon said there is already a significant access to justice issue for these individuals which may be amplified if they needed to figure out how to request materials from storage in Calgary.

Professor Tichon enquired about any consultations that had taken place at the Libraries Council concerning this matter.

Professor Prentice observed that the Senate Committee on Libraries has the responsibility, "To provide advice and make recommendations to Senate regarding

broad general policies for the development and maintenance of collections, services and facilities...” She suggested that Senate might request that the Committee provide a report to explore the possibility of entering into an agreement with the University of Calgary but also other potential solutions, including the construction of storage facility that could be shared by postsecondary institutions in Manitoba. She asked if there was a mechanism to request that the Committee provide Senate with such a report.

The Chair replied that he would look into the question.

Professor Thomson argued that the changing nature of academic libraries and collections is one reason for Senate to be involved in the decision. He recalled that conversations at the University of Chicago, which had led to a decision at that institution to build a high-density storage facility, had considered that the tactile quality of books and the ability to search books in their context were important. He suggested any decision should be informed by scholarly research, including in neuroscience, on how reading is evolving. For example, some research suggests that reading digital versus print books does not provide the same sense of chronological changes, which is important in some subjects. Digital materials may be better for some disciplines or to increase accessibility. Professor Thomson suggested the University must also consider the way students engage with physical text versus words on screens. Based on conversations with faculty in various disciplines, one thing that may be affecting usage of books in the Libraries is that students are not reading and that may be due, in part, to a different relationship to digital books.

The Chair said he was open to having a discussion at Senate. He remarked that, given the province’s current priority for funding healthcare, the University cannot expect it would provide capital funds to build a high-density storage facility. Saving physical books without transferring ownership of the materials was the reason for exploring the partnership with the University of Calgary. The other option is that the books will gradually be lost.

Professor Wang observed that, while the University of Manitoba has ranked at thirteenth or fourteenth among the U15 universities in the two previous years, the UM Libraries have ranked higher, at tenth place. Also, compared to other U15 universities of a similar size, the proportion of library space at the UM is significantly higher. Professor Wang suggested there should be a review of the Libraries’ budget and priorities, to determine whether the proposal to move the collections was a priority.

Ms. Dingwall remarked that the rationale provided to Senators, that the objective is to save the Libraries collections, differed from what has been presented at the Libraries Council, which focused on space. Referring to information provided on the number of books that have been disposed over the previous five years, she said weeding collections to remove materials that the Libraries should not keep in perpetuity, for example, where there are multiple copies or when newer editions are received, is an important practice. One that has not been done routinely in some of the Libraries’ locations. Ms. Dingwall objected to the characterization of the questions and concerns that had been raised as an emotional response. Concerns she was hearing from Librarians and faculty members relate to how they use the print collection for their teaching and research and the risks associated with those things not being housed in the Libraries.

The Chair said he would take Senators' comments back for consideration.

VI Consideration of the Minutes of the Meeting of December 4, 2024

Dr. C. Adams MOVED, seconded by Professor Bruce, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on December 4, 2024, be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

VII Business Arising from the Minutes

- 1) **Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures** Page 24
RE: Amendment to Senate Meeting Rules concerning
Approval Authority in an Emergency Situation (revised)

The Chair recalled that, at the November Senate meeting, Senate had referred this matter back to the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures, to define what would be considered an emergency.

Dean Jochelson said, since last reporting to Senate in November, the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures met on November 21 and participated in an electronic poll conducted between November 26 – 28, 2024, to consider further amendments to the *Approval Authority in an Emergency Situation* with respect to time-sensitive emergencies. He observed that, in this time, the University had also experienced a notional time-sensitive emergency at the Fort Garry Campus.

Dean Jochelson briefly reviewed the observations of the Committee, as outlined in the Report. He said, at Senate's request, the document was amended to add a definition of emergency, as this is defined in *The Emergency Measures Act*. Additional examples of an emergency were also added.

Dean Jochelson MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures concerning an amendment to the Senate Meeting Rules regarding Approval Authority in an Emergency Situation, effective upon Senate approval.

CARRIED

The Chair thanked Senators for their discussion of the document at the November meeting. Referring to the stipulation in the document that normal approval channels are to be restored by the President as soon as it is practicable, he observed that the event that had taken place on the Fort Garry Campus on November 19th may have been handled differently if this provision was in place at the time.

VIII Reports of the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 28

Professor J. Chen said the Senate Executive Committee met on December 11, 2024. The comments of the Committee accompany the reports on which they were made.

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

Professor Oliver said the Committee had not met since last reporting to Senate.

IX **Reports of other Committees of Senate, Faculty and School Councils**

1. **Proposal from the Université de Saint-Boniface** Page 29
RE: Diplôme postbaccalauréat en traduction juridique
par Internet

a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and** Page 29
Course Changes

Professor Teetzel said, when it met in October, the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes (SCCCC) had reviewed a proposal from the Université de Saint-Boniface to introduce a *Diplôme postbaccalauréat en traduction juridique par Internet*. The program stems from recommendations from Justice Canada to ensure all aspects of the law are more readily available in the French language. It is intended primarily for translators working in the field who are wanting to increase their learning and expertise in French language legal translation.

Professor Teetzel said the *D.P.B. en traduction juridique par Internet* will draw on courses previously approved by the Senates of the Université and the University of Manitoba. Students will be registered part-time and will complete 10 credit hours per year, to complete the 30-credit hour program over three years.

Professor Teetzel said the SCCC endorsed the proposal.

b) **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 31

Mr. Adams said the Senate Committee on Admissions (SCADM) had reviewed the proposal from an admissions perspective. The program will have an annual intake of ten students per year, from a national audience of translators. To be eligible for admission, applicants must have completed a bachelor's degree or certificate in translation. Applicants admitted based on the completion of a bachelor's degree in another discipline will be required to complete an entrance examination, to qualify for admission.

Mr. Adams said SCADM supports the proposal.

c) **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and** Page 32
Evaluation

Dr. Torchia said the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation (SCIE) met on November 21, 2024, to discuss the academic regulations for the program. He said students would be required to complete 30 credit hours of coursework, with a minimum Cumulative Grade Point Average of 3.0 (B). A grade of C would be the passing grade. Students who obtain a grade of D or lower in a required course would be required to repeat the course.

Professor Teetzel MOVED, on behalf of the Committees, THAT Senate approve a proposal from the Université de Saint-Boniface for a *Diplôme postbaccalauréat en traduction juridique par internet*.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2. **Report of the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences RE: Modification of Co-operative Education Program** Page 62

a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 62

Professor Teetzel said, when it met in October, the SCCCC considered a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, to modify the requirements for its Co-operative Education Program. The main changes, for students in any degree program offered by the Faculty is to require students to complete three work terms. Currently, students are required to complete two work terms plus an optional third work term. The objective for the changes is to ensure the program requirements are consistent with the Co-operative Education and Work-Integrated Learning Canada's (CEWIL) definition of co-operative education, including with respect to the required number of hours students must spend in work terms.

Professor Teetzel said the SCCCC endorses the proposal.

b) **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation** Page 64

Dr. Torchia said SCIE considered the proposal at its meeting on November 21st. The Faculty was also proposing to revise the entrance requirements, to require that students have completed at least 24 credit hours but not more than 90 credit hours toward their degree program by the start of their first work term.

Dr. Torchia called attention to observation 6 in the Report, which briefly describes proposed academic term requirements for the Co-operative Education Program, for students in both the Faculty's degree and diploma programs, including various reasons a student might be required to withdraw from the Co-operative Education Program.

Dr. Torchia said SCIE had endorsed the revisions proposed by the Faculty.

Dr. Torchia informed Senate that, based on a question that was raised at the Senate Executive Committee on December 11th, the Faculty was proposing an amendment to the wording of the final item in the list of reasons why a student may be required to withdraw from the Co-op program to read as follows:

The student does not exhibit sufficient ability, skills, aptitude, attitude, diligence or motivation to successfully complete the Co-operative Education Option, as assessed by the Co-op Coordinator in consultation with the Associate Dean and/or Diploma Program Director.

Professor Teetzel MOVED, on behalf of the Committees, THAT Senate approve the Reports of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes and the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning modifications to the curriculum and academic regulations for the Co-operative Education Program, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, effective for the 2025 Fall Term.

Ms. Dingwall observed that the proposal indicates the Faculty had previously required students in the Co-operative Education program to complete three work terms but, in 2018, had revised the program to require two mandatory and one optional work terms. She asked about the rationale for returning to three mandatory work terms.

Dean Scanlon explained that changes made to the program in 2018 were intended to address low enrolment in Co-operative Education Program. At the time, it was felt that the requirement for three mandatory work terms was an impediment to recruitment into the program. While the current requirements are not inconsistent with CEWIL's definition of co-operative education, there is some ambiguity related to whether employers are eligible for a tax credit where a student has completed two work terms versus three. The proposed change will remove this ambiguity. Dean Scanlon said, due to the work of the Faculty's Experiential Learning and Co-op Coordinator, recruitment to the program is no longer an issue. There were sixty-nine applicants to the program this year.

CARRIED, as amended.

3. Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation

- a) **RE: Modification of Dean's Honour Roll Regulations, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences** Page 73

Dr. Torchia said, at its meeting on November 21st, SCIE considered a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences to modify its regulations for the Dean's Honour Roll, to allow students registered with Student Accessibility Services, who have a reduced courseload as an approved accommodation, to be considered for the Dean's Honour Roll. To be placed on the Dean's Honour Roll, these students would be required to meet the same minimum Term Grade Point average as other students, which is 3.5. Students in a degree program who have been approved for the accommodation would be required to complete at least 9 credit hours per term, and students in the Diploma in Agriculture would be required complete at least 12 credit hours per term.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning modifications to the Dean's Honour Roll regulation, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, effective September 1, 2025.

CARRIED

- b) **RE: Modification of Dean's Honour Roll Requirements, Faculty of Social Work** Page 76

Dr. Torchia said, at the same meeting, the Committee considered a proposal from the Faculty of Social Work, to reduce the minimum course load requirements for students in the Bachelor of Social Work program who have a reduced courseload as an approved accommodation to be considered for the Dean's Honour Roll. These students must be registered in at least 6 credit hours with a standard grade each term, and they would be required to meet the same minimum Term Grade Point Average as other students, which is 3.6.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning modifications

to the requirements for the Dean's Honour Roll, Faculty of Social Work, effective September 1, 2025.

CARRIED

c) **RE: Modification of Règlement sur l'inaptitude professionnelle pour les étudiants et étudiantes, Faculté d'éducation, Université de Saint-Boniface**

Page 79

Dr. Torchia said, at the November 21st meeting, the Committee endorsed a proposal from the Université de Saint-Boniface to revise its *Règlement sur l'inaptitude professionnelle pour les étudiants et étudiantes à la Faculté d'éducation*. Specifically, the regulation will be amended to replace existing language with a statement that a teacher candidate may be referred to the Professional Unsuitability Committee (Comité d'examen de l'inaptitude professionnelle) if, despite reasonable accommodations having been provided as required by the *Manitoba Human Rights Code*, the student still experiences unsatisfactory performance in the program.

Dr. Torchia MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning modifications to the *Règlement sur l'inaptitude professionnelle pour les étudiants et étudiantes, Université de Saint-Boniface, effective September 1, 2025.*

Professor Thomson said a question had been raised at the committee about whether the provision concerning the use of alcohol or drugs, in the fourth bulleted item under the proposed new paragraph, is consistent with the *Manitoba Human Rights Code*. He asked whether an answer could be provided.

Dr. Dorrington, Vice-President, Academic and Research, Université de Saint-Boniface, replied that that stipulation was a long-standing one in the regulation. He said his understanding is that it is a direct translation from the language used in the University of Manitoba's *Professional Unsuitability Bylaw for Students in the Faculty of Education*.

The Chair indicated the question might be investigated after the meeting.

CARRIED

4. **Reports of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures**

a) **RE: Revisions to Desautels Faculty of Music Council Bylaws**

Page 82

Dean Jochelson said the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures (SCRP) met on November 21, 2024, to consider proposed changes to the *Desautels Faculty of Music Council Bylaws*. The revision to the voting membership, which was recommended and endorsed by the Desautels Faculty of Music Council, was to define the members of the support staff who would serve on the Council, as set out in the attachment to the Report.

Dean Jochelson MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures concerning revisions to the *Desautels Faculty of Music Council Bylaws*, effective upon Senate approval.

Professor Shaw observed that the bylaws established for various other Faculty Councils provide for support staff to elect support staff members to serve on the Council. He asked about the rationale for defining the support staff members based on their job position.

Professor Sparks said the Faculty Council had engaged in a conversation about this change. The decision to add the Undergraduate Student Advisor and the Graduate Program Assistant as members of the Council was made for two reasons. One is that these individuals attend a majority of the meetings already to contribute to various discussions. The second objective is to relieve some burden on support staff. The intent is for these individuals to inform other support staff on relevant matters discussed at the meetings.

CARRIED

b) RE: Revisions to the Rady Faculty of Health Sciences Bylaw Page 86

Dean Jochelson said, at the same meeting, SCRIP had considered a proposal from the Rady Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the *Rady Faculty of Health Sciences Bylaw*, including the membership of the Faculty Council and the Faculty Executive Council, to reflect the recent establishment of the College of Community and Global Health, as set out in the attachment to the Committee's Report.

Dean Jochelson MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures concerning revisions to the *Rady Faculty of Health Sciences Bylaw*, effective upon Senate approval.

CARRIED

5. Reports of the Senate Committee on University Research

a) RE: Revised Policy and Procedure on The Ethics of Research Involving Humans Page 97

On behalf of the Senate Committee on University Research (SCUR), Dr. Pinto introduced a proposal to revise the policy and procedure on *The Ethics of Research Involving Humans*. The revisions were precipitated by changes to *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans – TCPS 2 (2022)*, including the delegation of authority for other research ethics boards (REBs) due to an evolution in the ecosystem.

Dr. Pinto invited Dr. Schwartz, Director, Research Ethics and Compliance, to summarize recent changes to the process for submitting research proposals and protocols for review by an REB and related revisions to the policy and procedure. A copy of Dr. Schwartz's presentation, *Human Research Ethics*, is appended to the minutes.

Dr. Schwartz highlighted some of the key revisions to the policy and procedure, which include:

- enhanced definitions of terms used in the documents;
- updates to language used in the documents, for consistency with the TCPS 2 (2022) document;

- removal of outdated and inaccurate descriptions of processes;
- revisions to the composition of the Human Resource Ethics Committee;
- revisions to the appeals process, to reflect best practice.

Dr. Schwartz said revisions to the procedures, to allow for the REB of record to be the REB of another institution, reflect changes to the way research is done, including that some research projects are carried out by multi-disciplinary research teams, with members from multiple institutions.

Dr. Pinto MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research concerning revisions to the policy and procedure on *The Ethics of Research Involving Humans*, effective upon approval by the Board of Governors.

Professor Prentice said she supported the revisions and particularly the clarifications related to multi-jurisdictional research. She noted that the policy and procedure include provisions for the University to enter into ethics review agreements with other institutions, but she could not find information on any such agreements the University might have. She asked for some elaboration on what might be expected in terms of the changed process where a multi-jurisdictional review was needed.

Dr. Schwartz said the current policy does not allow for the University to enter into agreements with other institutions and their REBs, to make the review process more efficient. The proposed revisions will allow the University to review and approve submissions under the auspices of the UM or to delegate that responsibility to an REB at another institution with which the UM has an official agreement. The University is not engaged in any such agreements now, as the current policy and procedure do not allow for this.

Referring to sections 2.22 and 2.23 in the procedure, Dr. Duhamel said it was not clear, where an REB or an REB Chair identified a situation where there might be a conflict of interest for a researcher, whether this would be reported to the Vice-President (Administration) and the Vice-President (Research and International), as required under the *Conflict of Interest* policy and procedure.

Dr. Pinto replied that both the policy and procedure on *The Ethics of Research Involving Humans* are cross-referenced with the *Conflict of Interest* policy. He said there is an established process in the Office of the Vice-President (Research and International) (OVPRI) to investigate potential or alleged conflicts of interest and for reporting.

Professor Bunt noted that, different than the current procedure, which includes a goal for the REB to complete reviews within fifteen working days, the revised procedure does not specify a timeline for the REB review to be completed, and she enquired about the rationale for this. She observed that currently, lengthy delays in this step in the process have significant implications for students and faculty members, for both their research and promotion.

Dr. Schwartz said information on submission deadlines and the timeline for review is available on the intranet site for OVPRI, for the Fort Garry office. The timeline includes steps for a peer-review process and the REB review process. The procedure is not the

appropriate place for these details, perhaps, and it is easier to update the information on the intranet site, if adjustments to the timeline are made.

Referring to section 2.29 Scholarly Review, in the procedure, Professor Bunt asked whether the process described in this section is based on any requirements outlined in the TCPS 2 (2022) document versus institutional decisions. She observed that current challenges sometimes include a lack of acknowledgement of research expertise or pragmatics by an REB.

Dr. Schwartz said, across all sections of the revised document, the language used follows that used in the TCPS 2 (2022) wherever possible. Recognizing she has limited experience in her current role, Dr. Schwartz said she has not encountered the concern raised above. Acknowledging there are issues to be addressed yet, including the timeline for review, she said staff and researchers involved in the process work very hard, including the REB Chairs, who undertake the work as part of their service obligations and who also have teaching and research responsibilities. Proposed revisions to the policy and procedure and the development of standard operating procedures will support continued improvements to the review process.

In response to a question, Dr. Schwartz said both the current and revised policies include a section on academic freedom. In the revised policy, this section has been moved up in the document (sections 2.4 and 2.5) to recognize this under the main principles.

Ms. Dingwall said she has heard from several individuals who are interested in exploring particular research areas but have concerns that an REB will view their proposals as unusual or unconventional, in addition to concerns that the process will be too bureaucratic. These things have deterred them from applying for review. Ms. Dingwall said the process should support researchers to carry out the research projects they want to do, while also following the TCPS 2 (2022) guidelines.

Dr. Schwartz replied that the goal of the human research enterprise is to facilitate researchers. In instances where researchers suggest research approaches that might not comply with the TCPS 2 (2022) principles, there is a discussion with the REB members and Chair and the researcher regarding how the research can proceed in a way that is both compliant with the TCPS 2 (2022) requirements and meets the objectives of the researcher. The process is intended to be a check versus a barrier.

Ms. Dingwall observed that the TCPS 2 (2022) guidelines also describe a process for informal resolutions to occur in the way described above, but this is not captured in the revised policy. She asked about the decision not to outline this option in the procedure.

Dr. Schwartz said a decision had been made more broadly not to detail certain processes in the policy and procedure. With respect to informal resolutions, the language has been strengthened in the procedure, and membership of the REBs is available on the OVPRI's intranet site. Dr. Schwartz said the Co-Chairs of the REBs spend significant time speaking with, and supporting, researchers but they also have an obligation to ensure that research carried out at the University complies with the TCPS 2 (2022) guidelines. She underscored that there are people available to provide support and she invited researchers to connect with the OVPRI or with her directly to facilitate communications with an REB Co-Chair.

Professor Figley asked, with regard to section 2.7 in the policy, which sets out various circumstances in which REB review and approval will not normally be required, and section 2.8, which outlines what must be done when a researcher is not certain about whether REB review is needed, whether consideration had been given to listing specific situations in which a review is not needed. His concern was that some might interpret these two sections taken together to mean that anything listed in sections 2.7 (a) through (g) would almost automatically require a researcher to obtain a written opinion of the REB Chair.

Dr. Schwartz replied that the qualifier “normally” is used, rather than listing each of the various circumstances in which a review would not be required, as the latter approach would require that the policy be revised each time the list was amended. Also, the flexibility in the language provides for conversations to occur with an REB Chair to determine whether a review is necessary if questions arise in a particular circumstance.

Professor Balneaves noted that the College of Nursing is geographically located on the Fort Garry Campus but is a college of the Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, which has other colleges located at the Bannatyne Campus. Under the current policy and procedure, researchers in the College submit proposals that require REB review for consideration by REB 1, which has responsibility for reviewing protocols of researchers in Nursing and some other academic units located at the Fort Garry Campus. The College works to ensure that the REB 1 membership includes individuals who understand nursing research. Referring to the appendices and the flow chart attached to the revised policy and procedure, Professor Balneaves sought assurance that, under the revised policy and procedure, the scholarly review of proposals from researchers in Nursing will not be determined by the geographic location of the College but the nature of the research proposal, to ensure a quality review is carried out by research peers with expertise in nursing research. In particular, she asked about the process for deciding whether a research project would be reviewed by either one of REB 1 or REB 2 or one or the REBs under the Research Manitoba RITHIM Initiative (i.e., Health Research Ethics Board (HREB), or the Biomedical Research Ethics Board (BREB)).

Dr. Schwartz replied that the University will work with RITHIM to develop a series of questions that will assist researchers to determine whether their research protocol should be reviewed under either REB 1 / REB 2, the HREB, or the BREB.

The Chair thanked Dr. Schwartz for her work to revise the policy and procedure.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**b) RE: Proposal for a University of Manitoba Chair in
Beef Cattle Economic Sustainability, Department of
Animal Science, Faculty of Agricultural and Food
Sciences**

Page 133

Dr. Pinto reviewed a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences to establish a University of Manitoba Chair in Beef Cattle Economic Sustainability, which would be held in the Department of Animal Science. The Chair would be supported by donations totaling \$3 million, including a \$1.5 million investment from the Beef Cattle Research Council, that will provide for an annual allocation of \$300,000, for a ten-year term. The annual allocation will be used to cover costs including the salary and benefits of the Chair, the salary and benefits of a Post-doctoral Fellow or Research Associate,

stipends for graduate and undergraduate students, supplies and materials, and knowledge dissemination.

Dr. Pinto MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research concerning a proposal for a University of Manitoba Chair in Beef Cattle Economic Sustainability, Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, effective upon approval by the Board of Governors.

CARRIED

- c) **RE: Revised Terms of Reference for Manitoba Strategic Research Chair in Sustainable Protein, Department of Food and Human Nutritional Sciences, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences**

Page 142

Dr. Pinto said the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences is proposing to revise the terms of reference for the Manitoba Strategic Research Chair in Sustainable Protein, to expand the eligibility for the Chair, to provide for the appointment of a researcher at the rank of either Professor or Associate Professor. Dr. Pinto observed that the position is currently vacant following the passing of the inaugural Chair holder, Dr. James House, in September 2024.

Dr. Pinto MOVED, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research concerning revisions to the Manitoba Strategic Research Chair in Sustainable Protein, Department of Food and Human Nutritional Sciences, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, effective upon approval by the Board of Governors.

CARRIED

X **Additional Business** - none

XI **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 pm.

These minutes pages 1 to 16, together with the agenda, pages 1 to 150, and the presentation, *Human Research Ethics*, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on January 8, 2025.