ARTS FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting held on:
Friday, February 8, 2008
at 2:30pm
in 306 Tier Building

Present: Richard Sigurdson (Dean of Arts and Chair), Barry Ferguson (Associate Dean), Linda Wilson (Associate Dean); Classics: John Tamm; English, Film, and Theatre: Brenda Austin-Smith, Diana Brydon, Michelle Faubert, Robert Finnegan, Adam Muller, Robert O’Kell, Judith Owens, Arlene Young; French, Spanish & Italian: Constance Cartmill, Andrew Osborne; German & Slavic Studies: Cheryl Dueck, Myroslav Shkandrij; History: Gerald Friesen, Mark Gabbert, Greg Smith; Icelandic: Birna Bjarnadóttir; Labour Studies: Julie Guard; Linguistics: Robert Hagiwara, David Pentland; Native Studies: Renate Eigenbrod; Psychology: Tammy Ivanco, Randall Jamieson, Harvey Keselman, Richard Kruk, Jim Nickels, Roger Wilson; Religion: Brenda Cantelo; Sociology: Susan Prentice; Mathematics: Robert Thomas; Student Representatives: Harley Shepherd (St. John’s College), Aimée Pochinko (Arts Student Senator); Support Staff Representatives: Mary Kuzmeniuk, Janet Sealey, Lise Durand (Recording Secretary).

Regrets: Janice Ristock (Associate Dean); Classics: Lea Stirling; Economics: Irwin Lipnowski, Wayne Simpson, Elizabeth Troutt; English, Film, and Theatre: Warren Cariou, Mark Libin, Margaret Groome; French, Spanish & Italian: Dominique Laporte; German & Slavic Studies: Rosemarie Finlay, Stephan Jaeger; History: Tina Chen, Michael Kinnear, Len Kuffert, Jorge Nallim, Tom Nesmith; Icelandic: Helga Hilmisdottir; Political Studies: Fiona MacDonald, Rod Yellon; Psychology: Melanie Glenwright, Ed Johnson, Jason Leboe, Corey Mackenzie, Marian Morry, Katherine Starzyk; Religion: Lisa Alexandrin, David Drewes, Kenneth MacKendrick; Sociology: Cheryl Albas, Dan Albas, Christopher Fries, Rod Kueneman, Lori Wilkinson; Women’s & Gender Studies: Liz Millward; St. Boniface College: Ibrahima Diallo (Dean of Arts); St. Paul’s College: Denis Bracken (Rector); Mathematics: Thomas Kucera; Student Representatives: Jen Dengate (St. John’s College).

(1) Adoption of the Agenda

MOTION (E. Comack/A. Young): that the agenda be adopted with the following change:
That item 7 b (Navitas Update from Arts Senators) be discussed prior to item 2 (Announcements).

MOTION CARRIED
(b) Navitas Update from Arts Senators

On behalf of the Arts Senators, Arlene Young reported the following:

- At the January meeting of Senate, Dr. Kerr indicated that there were communication problems which caused a premature announcement of the Navitas project by Navitas rather than by the University. The University had intended to notify Senate first.
- At the January meeting of the Board of Governors there was a motion to refer the Navitas agreement to Senate. That motion was voted down. The Dean of Arts spoke against the motion and voted against it. The members of the Board of Governors were not explicitly informed that the Arts Faculty Council voted almost unanimously on their motion.
- At the Senate meeting, Mark Gabbert made a motion similar to the one he had made at the meeting of Arts Faculty Council. Many Arts Senators spoke for the motion and many Deans spoke against it. The Dean of Arts spoke against the motion.
- Also Senate was informed that there would be an Oversight Committee related to the whole process which would include the Dean of Arts, the Dean of Science, the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC) Chair, and 3 members of Navitas (ICM). The Committee will be chaired by the Vice-Provost (Programs), Richard Lobdell.
- Dr. Young indicated that Dr. Gabbert’s motion to Senate was defeated 34 to 41.
- Dr. Young gave notice of a motion of censure against the Dean which would be introduced at the next Arts Faculty Council meeting.

Dr. Prentice indicated that the University has policies in place regarding transfer credit from other institutions and expressed concerns about the legitimacy of accepting courses through Navitas, which do not fall under any University policies.

Dean Sigurdson indicated that the President announced at the Senate meeting that the framework agreement, exclusive of the financial arrangements, will be made public.

Dr. Julie Guard indicated that her understanding was that Senate will only be getting selected items from the contract and not the contract itself. The request from Senate was that the contract be referred to Senate for review to assess the academic merits of the proposal. It is, in fact, only coming for information and not for discussion or approval.

Dean Sigurdson indicated that contracts do not go to Senate for approval. The Dean reminded Faculty Council that we were not talking about a “proposed agreement” with Navitas, but that the University had already agreed to and signed a contract regarding the creation of ICM. It is his understanding that the contract is one with serious default liabilities. The Dean indicated that he had no prior
knowledge of this contract, and agreed that the process was poorly handled by the University. Yet, the Dean indicated that he felt compelled to vote at the Board against a motion that would send something back to Senate that could not have any other outcome than to have the University uphold the contract or pay serious liabilities. The Dean is encouraged that there will be academic oversight committee, and that departments will determine if courses are offered at ICM.

Dr. Robert O’Kell indicated that he was not at the Senate meeting, nor at the Board meeting. However, he noted that Dr. Kerr’s comments to Arts Faculty Council raised a number of concerns:

- Would Instructors of Navitas have academic freedom?
- Would students in Navitas have the same disciplinary procedures or standards applied to their course work as do students in Arts, particularly related to academic dishonesty?
- Those administrators who have signed a contract with serious default liability should be fired forthwith.

Dr. Judith Owens spoke in support of the Dean’s ability as a member of the Board and Senate to speak against any motions, including Dr. Gabbert’s motion.

Dr. Julie Guard indicated that she understood the Dean’s explanation of why he voted the way he did, but noted that the Dean must still represent the interests of the Faculty of Arts. She noted that one member of the Board who is a lawyer wondered if the naming of ICM may contradict the Manitoba Act. She further stated that the Dean of the Faculty must ensure academic integrity.

Dean Sigurdson indicated that he hopes members of Council will have some appreciation for the difficult position in which he finds himself. This agreement was not presented to Deans and Directors Council, and the first he heard of Navitas was when Dr. Mark Gabbert mentioned it on the floor of Senate. It was because he felt this was a very important matter that he requested that the Vice-President (Academic) attend Faculty Council, and made arrangements at short notice for this meeting. Since then, the Dean has learned more about Navitas and ICM, having now heard Dr. Kerr’s presentation five times. Dean Sigurdson indicated that he was not happy with the process and never saw why it could not have been presented to Senate earlier. But it was not, and that was obviously not his decision to make. Nevertheless, at this stage, and as an officer of the University, the Dean indicated that he has to look at what is in the best interest of the Faculty of Arts and the University as a whole. He reiterated that he believes that referring the matter back to Senate is not the best use of Senate’s time, especially given that it would not overrule or end the agreement. In any event, Senate did have a chance to make this decision on its own, and voted against reviewing the matter further.

The Dean responded to criticism of his actions at the Board of Governors meeting. He felt that he spoke in a more balanced way than any of the other speakers, giving both sides of the argument. While he may not have pointed out explicitly that Arts Faculty Council had voted in the manner it did, he openly
acknowledged and outlined the concerns raised by members of Faculty Council. There were, as well, other members from Arts present, who spoke in favour of the motion to send the matter to Senate. The Dean indicated that he told the Board members that he feels that certain concerns about ICM are valid, and he explained to them the reservations of many members of the Faculty. Yet he did not support sending the matter back to Senate. Clearly, the Board was made fully aware of all views before it voted. In the end, the Board still did not support the motion to refer the matter back to Senate.

The Dean indicated that, at this stage, the best way to protect academic integrity, academic freedom, and academic honesty is to play as strong a role as possible as Department Heads and other faculty members who will select individuals to teach ICM courses and to review their syllabi. Those who will teach in the ICM will be approved by departments, and will often be the same people who work for us as sessionals. We need to protect the Faculty’s academic values, which the Dean intends to do as a member of the Oversight Committee. It is certain that the Chair of the SPPC and the Dean of Science will take on the same role.

The Dean mentioned that he contacted individuals at Simon Fraser University, which has a similar agreement with Fraser International College of FIC (their version of ICM). Persons with whom he spoke had positive comments about the program. They indicated that those students that came into the Faculty at Simon Fraser this year were quite well prepared.

Dean Sigurdson indicated that there will be an evaluation process of the ICM and the stance the Faculty should take now is to ensure students in the program get the highest quality service, are treated fairly on this campus, and are as well prepared as possible if they become our students. Many of us complain about the quality of language skills of our international students: perhaps the ICM will improve this.

Dr. Young indicated that the ICM might work out, and that it is up to Senate to ensure that it does. However, the vote of censure against the Dean is about the erosion of Senate’s powers. She said that the Dean misrepresented what happened at Arts Faculty Council by stating that a majority of members voted for the motion instead of making more clear that almost all members voted for it. She said that if Senate had understood how strongly Arts felt at the time, it may have changed its vote.

Dr. Brenda Austin-Smith indicated that she was personally disappointed by the Dean’s comments at the Board. She was a participating member at the Board meeting, and reported that the Dean did identify concerns from Arts, but did not mention the motion. The Dean distinguished his own position from that of Faculty of Arts members. She said that many of the members of the Board of Governors looked to the Dean of Arts for direction, and that she felt that many of them had no idea what they were being asked to consider.

Dr. Diana Brydon indicated that she consulted the Navitas website which stated that students who take courses in the ICM will be guaranteed acceptance into the 2nd year at the University of Manitoba. That is a concern.
The Dean indicated that students would still have to meet our entrance requirements.

Dr. Gabbert explained that the fundamental concern is not whether it is practical to get out of Navitas, but rather that the body in charge of academic matters at the University did not know the full facts of the matter. The purpose of his motion was to ensure that Senate would receive SPPC’s recommendation. He also noted that the Dean never indicated in public his distress about the way in which the matter was handled. He further stated that he felt that the Dean must decide either to support the administration or go along with what Faculty Council says. He noted that it would be a bad thing if the Dean were to deviate from the will of Council, as some previous Deans had done. Dr. Gabbert indicated that in his view the oversight committee has no authority at all and that it is unacceptable to think that contracts are not a matter for Senate.

Dr. Prentice indicated that her issue with the Dean was personal. She had asked the Dean to speak at Senate. She hoped that the Dean spoke not because she had asked him, but because he felt obliged to report the Faculty Council vote. She also stated that she felt that the Board had no prior indication that there was a problem and didn’t know what Navitas was. She said that the Dean indicated to the Board that the Faculty had concerns, but that he still voted against referring the matter back to Senate. Dr. Prentice indicated that if the Board had known that it was a procedurally proper step that had been taken by the Arts Faculty Council, they may have been swayed. Also, there are a number of academic matters to consider and it is not up to an Ad Hoc Oversight Committee to assess and advise on transfer credit. Referring the matter back to Senate was not just to quash the contract, but an attempt to figure out how to proceed.

(2) ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Dean announced that:
- the Distinguished Professor nominations of George Toles and Dawne McCance were approved by the Board and that they will be recognized at the Spring Convocation;
- the Professor Emeritus nomination for Henry Rempel was also approved by the Board on January 29, 2008. His title will also be conferred at Spring Convocation;
- The Board of Governors approved the following name changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Name</th>
<th>New Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>Department of English, Film, and Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies Program</td>
<td>Women’s and Gender Studies Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Events and Key Dates

**Wednesday, February 13**  Sociology Headship Public Presentation
10:30am
307 Tier Building
Candidate to be announced.
Monday, February 18  
New Holiday – Louis Riel Day (University Closed)

Tuesday, February 26  
URGP applications due in the Dean’s Office

UM/SSHRC Travel & Research Grant applications due in the Dean’s Office

Saturday, March 1  
Deadline for Requests for Dean’s Office Funding (Yellow Form)

Friday, March 14  
Deadline for Awards of Excellence Nominations

Friday, March 21  
Good Friday (University Closed)

Monday, March 31  
Deadline for Travel and Conference Sponsorship Program Applications (Vice-President’s Office)

Thursday, April 10  
Next Arts Faculty Council Meeting
2:30pm
306 Tier Building

MOTION (M. Gabbert/D. Brydon): that the agenda be amended to move item 6 (b) Arts Academic Regulations Policy Committee report to now.

MOTION CARRIED

(6) REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

(b) Arts Academic Regulations Policy Committee: Meeting of January 15, 2008

A revised “Overview of Degree Regulations” document was circulated. Jim Nickels, Chair of the ARPC, presented the report to the Arts Faculty Council.

MOTION #1 (J. Nickels): that the proposal to allow a Double Major in the B.A. General and the B.A. Advanced degree programs be approved.

Cheryl Dueck, Head of German & Slavic Studies, spoke in favour of the motion.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION #2 (J. Nickels): that the proposal to allow a student in an Honours program to declare a minor be approved.

Aimée Pochinko, Arts Student Senator, spoke in favour of the motion.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION #3 (J. Nickels): that a revision of the current degree regulations for the B.A. General, B.A. Advanced and B.A. Honours programs which establishes a residency requirement on the courses required in the Major, Advanced Major, and Honours subjects be approved.
MOTION #3 Amended (L. Wilson/C. Dueck): that with respect to the residency requirements on the courses required in the Major, Advanced Major, and Honours subjects, that where “the University of Manitoba” appears, “or an approved University of Manitoba exchange program” be added.  

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION #4 (J. Nickels): that the establishment of a degree regulation that would restrict students from completing a Second degree at the same level or lower level in the same discipline(s) be approved.

MOTION #4 Amended (J. Owens/S. Prentice): that recommendation #1 on page 9 be amended as follows:

“1) Students cannot obtain a second degree in the same discipline or department at the same or lower level as any…”

MOTION CARRIED

(2) ANNOUNCEMENTS

(b) Updates from the Associate Deans

There were no updates from the Associate Deans.

(c) Hiring Update

There was no hiring update by the Dean.

(d) Budget Update

There was no budget update by the Dean.

(3) MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 18, 2007

MOTION (R. O’Kell/R. Hagiwara): that the minutes be adopted as circulated.  

MOTION CARRIED

(4) BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

(5) REPORT OF THE ARTS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: MEETING OF DECEMBER 6, 2007

The Dean indicated that the report was circulated for information. There were no questions pertaining to the report.
REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

(a) Arts Course and Program Approvals Committee: Meeting of January 14, 2008

The Dean indicated that the CPAC report was circulated for information. Dr. Barry Ferguson, Chair of CPAC, spoke briefly to the report. There were no questions pertaining to the report.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

(a) Update on University College

The Dean indicated that he circulated yesterday a proposed new governing document to University College members which was discussed at University College Council on January 16, 2008. The major changes or proposals that have come forward are the following:

- Reporting line: Instead of reporting to the Vice-President (Academic) & Provost, University College would report to the Dean of Arts.
- Clarify the membership: Add support staff from departments who reside in the College and those who are in the general office of University College as members.
- Clarify/amend language: Remove references to the residence, registrar or officers in the old governing document.
- Maintaining a role for students and student governance: There is the possibility to re-engage students and have a University College Students Association. The College is now home to the Presidents’ Scholars, but it will be left to the new College Council to decide which students will be included as members or how the students will be included in College Council.
- Instead of having a Provost to head the College, the position will be renamed to the “Head of College of University College” who will have delegated administrative powers for University College. College Council will determine committees and membership.
- University College has real interdisciplinary studies strengths and community outreach. The Dean’s goal, provided that the College Council and the new Head of College so decide, would be to assign a budget to pursue these purposes, such as having a Cultural Producer in Residence and having a Visiting Scholar every year.

The Dean indicated that a revised document will be forwarded to the Vice-President (Academic) for approval and that some elements would require Senate approval as well.

QUESTION PERIOD

Aimée Pochinko, Arts Student Senator, indicated that the Arts Student Body Council may be hosting a wine and cheese for Arts faculty, Dean’s Office staff, and perhaps support staff to coincide with the change over of new council for next year.
(9) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.