THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
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ARTS FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting held on:
Friday, April 10, 2008
at 2:30pm
in 100 Fletcher Argue Building

Present: Richard Sigurdson (Dean of Arts and Chair), Janice Ristock (Associate Dean), Linda Wilson (Associate Dean); Anthropology: Greg Monks; Asian Studies: William Lee; Classics: James Chlup, Rory Egan, Mark Joyal, John Tamm; Economics: Fletcher Baragar, Laura Brown, Robert Chernomas, George Chuchman, Ian Hudson, Irwin Lipnowski, John Loxley, Elizabeth Troutt, Jesse Vorst; English, Film, and Theatre: Brenda, Austin-Smith, Diana Brydon, Alison Calder, Roy Campbell, Warren Cariou, Glenn Clark, Fernando DeToro, Michelle Faubert, Robert Finnegan, Margaret Groome, Serenity Joo, William Kerr, Daniel Lenoski, Mark Libin, Dana Medoro, Adam Muller, Robert O’Kell, Pam Perkins, John Rempel, Robert Smith, Vanessa Warne, David Williams, Arlene Young; French, Spanish and Italian: Etienne Beaulieu, Constance Cartmill, Enrique Fernandez, Alan MacDonell, Andrew Osborne, Sarah Rocheville; German and Slavic Studies: Natalia Aponiuk, Elena Baraban, Cheryl Dueck, Stephan Jaeger; History: Tim Anna, Joyce Chadya, Tina Chen, David Churchill, Chris Frank, Gerald Friesen, Jean Friesen, Mark Gabbert, Henry Heller, Esyllt Jones, Michael Kinnear, Jorge Nallim, Tom Nesmith, Greg Smith, Ravi Vaitheespara; Icelandic: Birna Bjarnadóttir, Helga Hilmsdóttir; Labour Studies: David Camfield, Julie Guard; Linguistics: Jila Ghomeshi, David Pentland, Chris Wolfart; Native Studies: Renate Eigenbrod; Philosophy: Jack Bailey, Don McCarthy, Robert Shaver; Political Studies: Marek Debicki, Radhika Desai, Kiera Ladner, George MacLean, Margaret Ogrodnick, Kim Speers, Lasha Tchantouridze; Psychology: Daniel Bailis, Jessica Cameron, Steve Holborn, Tammy Ivanco, Randall Jamieson, Ed Johnson, Harvey Keselman, Richard Kruk, Jason Leboe, Les Leventhal, Barry Mallin, Jonathan Marotta, David Martin, Garry Martin, Todd Mondor, Janine Montgomery, Marian Morry, Joseph Pear, Raymond Perry, Gerry Sande, Jim Shapiro, Katherine Starzyk, Jacque Vorauer, Roger Wilson, C.T. (Dickie) Yu; Religion: Elizabeth Alexandrin, Laurence Broadhurst, Brenda Cantelo, David Drewes, Kenneth MacKendrick, Ian Whicher; Sociology: Sonia Bookman, Elizabeth Comack, Frank Cormier, Chris Fries, Rod Kueneman, Susan Prentice, Russell Smandych, Lori Wilkinson; Women's and Gender Studies: Liz Millward; Mathematics: Robert Thomas; Science: Mark Whitmore (Dean); St. Boniface College: Ibrahima Diallo (Dean of Arts); St. Andrew's College: Roman Bozyk (Acting Principal); Support Staff Representatives: Janet Sealey (Dean’s Office), Gerry Strom (Dean’s Office), Mary Kuzmeniuk (Psychology); Student Representatives: Katrina Broughton (Arts Student Body Council), Daniel Draper (Arts Student Body Council), Aimée Pochinko (Arts Student Body Council), Jen Dengate (St. John’s College Students’ Association), Harley Shepherd (St. John’s College Students’ Association); Lise Durand (Recording Secretary).
Non-Members Present: Daniela Smith-Fernandez (Arts Student)

Regrets: Anthropology: Ellen Judd; Classics: Lea Stirling; English, Film, and Theatre: Faye McIntyre; French, Spanish and Italian: Dominique Laporte; German and Slavic Studies: Rosemarie Finlay; Linguistics: Robert Hagiwara, Moshe Nahir; Psychology: Melanie Glenwright, Jim Nickels; Mathematics: Thomas Kucera.

(1) **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION** (R. O’Kell/L. Wilson): that the agenda be adopted as circulated.

(2) **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(a) **Events and Key Dates**

The Dean indicated that the information about upcoming events and key dates have been circulated on paper.

(b) **Updates from the Associate Deans**

**Janice Ristock**

- Some of the results from the fall research grants competitions have been announced:
  - NSERC: 3 out of 5 applicants were successful, all three are from Psychology
  - SSHRC Standard Research Grants: the University success rate is a disappointing 18% (likely below the national average) in Arts, 4 of 25 applicants were successful and 13 made the 4A list.
- Arts Program Development Fund Grants competition: applications are made for $1,000 to help in the preparation of major research grants (SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR), the deadline for applications is May 2.
- Please inform the Dean’s Office if you have received any grants as a co-investigator since that information is not available in the Faculty or in the Office of Research Services.

**Linda Wilson**

- In the next couple of days, Arts instructors will be receiving several e-mails about some academic matters.
- Faculty members are encouraged to attend the ASBC’s Final Affair. The event takes place on May 2 at 6pm and tickets are $25 for 1 ticket or $30 for 2 tickets. Dr. Wilson would be pleased to facilitate the purchase of tickets.

(c) **Hiring Update**

The Dean mentioned that the requests for SIP positions from departments are due in the Dean’s Office on April 28. He added that the hiring process for the year is still ongoing. Including term positions, there are 19 searches for UMFA positions and, so far, 3 searches have had failed but they will be re-advertised next year.
These 3 failed searches were in niche areas and are therefore not a reflection of the package we offer to new hires.

The Dean announced that the Faculty of Arts has made a nomination for a SSHRC Canada Research Chair and an offer has been made for an NSERC Canada Research Chair.

\(d\) **Budget Update**

The Dean reported that the provincial budget was delivered yesterday. The Province of Manitoba announced that the tuition freeze will end beginning in the 2009-2010 Academic Year. However, the increase in tuition will be regulated. As was announced at Deans’ and Directors’ Council, this current fiscal year will be “another very lean year”. There will be a 7% increase, but that is not for the overall budget; it is 7% of 56% of the University’s total budget. The 7% increase still does not keep up with the University Price index, which calls for approximately a 10% increase.

The Dean mentioned that the University’s budget may be announced in May this year, rather then June as was the case last year.

\(i\) **Update on Project Domino**

The Dean indicated that today the Provincial Government announced that they will provide $47 million towards Project Domino. Project Domino, which was approved by the Board of Governors and Senate in March, is a $102 million project. This project was developed by Alan Simms, Associate Vice-President (Administration), and will see the renovation of the existing physical environment at the University of Manitoba rather then constructing new buildings which is very costly. The plan includes:

- The moving of Pharmacy to a new building downtown;
- The moving of Biological Sciences into Pharmacy’s old building;
- The building of a new state-of-the-art student residence;
- The renovation of Taché Hall and its unused auditorium;
- The move of the Faculty of Music and the School of Arts into the newly renovated Taché Hall which the renovated auditorium becoming a performance space of Music;
- Music’s old building will become International House, which will include the University’s international programs (ESL, Exchange Programs, and International Office);
- The Fitzgerald Building will become the home of the Faculty of Graduate Studies;
- Music will vacate the space in University College and the Great Hall will become a theatre for the Black Hole Theatre and the kitchen area will become dressing rooms and set construction space.

Project Domino will take 3 to 5 years to complete.
MOTION (A. Young/B. Austin-Smith): that the minutes of the meeting of February 8, 2008 be adopted with the following amendments:

Page 1, item 1: “(E. Comack S. Prentice/A. Young)”.

Page 2, item 7 (b), bullet #2: “The members of the Board of Governors were not explicitly informed by the Dean of Arts that the Arts Faculty Council voted almost unanimously except for 1 abstention on their motion.

Page 2, item 7 (b), bullet #3: “Many Arts Senators, including Arts Senators, Science Senators, and Student Senators, spoke for the motion…”

Page 2, item 7 (b), bullet #6: “Dr. Young gave notice of a motion of censure against the Dean for his failure to represent the view of the members of the Faculty of Arts fairly, accurately, and completely. This motion which would be introduced at the next Arts Faculty Council meeting.”

Page 4, paragraph #5: “However, the motion vote of censure against the Dean in Senate is was about the erosion of Senate’s powers. She said that, The vote of censure against the Dean misrepresented is about the Dean’s failure to represent fairly what had happened at Arts in Faculty Council…”

Page 4, paragraph #6: “She participated as an UMFA Assessor participating member at the Board meeting…”

Page 5, Paragraph #3: “Dr. Prentice indicated that she had personally spoken with the Dean to request that he speak at Senate and that her issue with the Dean…”

CARRIED

Dean Sigurdson vacated the Chair and Associate Dean Janice Ristock assumed the Chair.

(4) BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(a) Motion of Censure

MOTION (R. Wilson): that this portion of the meeting take place in closed session.

DEFEATED

Dr. Ristock indicated that the Executive Committee and the Arts Rules and Procedures Committee discussed the proceedings for this portion of the meeting. The following rules will apply:

- After the motion is made, the Dean will have an opportunity to respond;
- The floor will then be opened for debate and according to the rules there is a time limit of 45 minutes beginning at the start of the debate;
- A motion may be made to extend the debate or to close the debate and both motions require 2/3 majority;
• When the debate has ended, a vote will be done by secret ballot;
• Dr. Gerry Friesen (member of the Executive Committee) and Ms. Lise Durand (Secretary to Arts Faculty Council) will be the Returning Officers and they will count and report back prior to the adjournment of the meeting;
• Simple majority is needed and the vote will be recorded in the minutes;
• Members of Council may only speak to the motion and not to any broader issues;
• Only Members of Council may vote or speak on the motion;
• Three members of the Arts Rules and Procedures Committee (Dr. Rory Egan, Dr. Robert O’Kell, Dr. David Pentland) will act as a resource on procedural matters.

POINT OF PROCEDURE (A. Young): “I would like my comments to be recorded in the minutes in full. I will provide the secretary with a copy of the text of my comments to that any subsequent discussion of this matter will have an accurate text to which to refer.”

The motion I am about to read was submitted to Faculty Council by six Arts Senators:

   Timothy Anna, Distinguished Professor of History  
   Mark Gabbert, Head, Department of History  
   Mark Joyal, Head, Department of Classics  
   Judith Owens, Head, Department of English  
   Susan Prentice, Department of Sociology  
   Arlene Young, Associate Head, Department of English

For the purposes of the presentation of the motion, I am their spokesperson.

You have all received copies of the motion and the attachments that we submitted. We would like to thank the Arts Office for circulating hard copies of these materials.”

At the request for Dr. Arlene Young, Dr. Ristock provided a definition of censure as provided by Mr. Jeff Leclerc (University Secretary):

   Censure is “a motion condemning the Government, a Minister, or a private Member for some position which they hold or for some action or lack of action for which they are responsible.

   It is a formal reprimand. It is not equivalent to a motion of no confidence thus a person can continue in office even if censured.”

Dr. Arlene Young continued:

   “I would like to point out that this motion does not refer to any vote cast by the Dean at the Board of Governors or at Senate. We respect his right to vote freely, however much we may disagree with him. This motion is about his failure to represent the formally expressed concerns of this Council fairly, accurately, and completely.

MOTION (A. Young/T. Anna):

[Dr. Arlene Young read the motion as circulated]
Most of you know about the issues that have led to this motion, but I will briefly review them for those of you who may not be familiar with all the steps that have led us to this moment.

At the December meeting of Senate, Mark Gabbert asked the Administration about an ad that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* for a Principal of the International College of Manitoba (to be located on the University of Manitoba campus). It emerged that, unbeknownst to the Senate or the Board of Governors, the University Administration had signed a contract with Navitas International to offer a two-year programme for international students that would provide courses equivalent to the last year of high-school and the first year of university. The Administration took the position that it had the right to sign this contract without consulting Senate. Many senators objected, insisting that Senate is the only body that has the authority to approve academic matters.

The reaction of members of the Faculty of Arts to this situation ranged from dismay to outrage. The Vice-President Academic, Robert Kerr, was invited by the Dean to speak to Arts Council at its December 18th, 2007 meeting. Members of Arts Council asked pointed questions about the ethics and legality of the contract and everything that the contract implied. After listening to Dr. Kerr’s account of these matters, Arts Council passed the motion that has been distributed as note 1, calling on the Administration to submit the proposal to establish a Navitas college on the University of Manitoba campus to Senate for its consideration. It was clear to anyone at that meeting that the Faculty as a body felt strongly about the Navitas issue and about Senate’s rights and responsibilities to review and make recommendations and determinations about post-secondary courses and programmes that are going to be taught on this campus. As the motion indicates, the Dean did not communicate Arts Council’s strongly held and strongly voiced concerns to the Senate at its January meeting, at which Navitas was again discussed at length, although he has affirmed that he sent an e-mail to the President.

The Dean believes that Arts Faculty Council has no right to censure him for not speaking at the January Senate meeting, or for what he said at the Board of Governors meeting of January 29th. However, what the Dean didn’t say at Senate and what he did say at the Board of Governors form a pattern of responses to Arts Faculty Council’s concerns about the Navitas matter. The Dean apparently felt that in simply responding to the letter of the motion – pass on our concerns to the President and the University Secretary – that he had fully discharged his obligation to us. The profound misgivings that Council expressed and the substance of those misgivings are things that he did not communicate to Senate itself at its next meeting, and that he did not call on the Administration to acknowledge publicly. At the Board of Governors’ meeting of January 29th, 2008, a motion similar to the one passed by Arts Council, and similar to the one that was on the February 6th, 2008 Senate agenda, was on the table.

When the Dean spoke to that motion, which came from the student representatives on the Board of Governors, his comments were as you see here. He identifies his role as Dean of Arts as administrative, as a middle-management
position with a strong allegiance to the Administration. He makes no reference to any collegial responsibility to members of the Faculty of Arts. He makes reference to the Faculty of Arts as the perceived trouble-makers of the University, who make Faculty Council an unpleasant place for him. He praises Dr. Kerr for his willingness to listen to us. Surely this was the least the Vice-President could do, given that he was one of the people most instrumental in creating this very messy and unpleasant affair. After having disparaged his own Faculty in this way, the Dean acknowledges that we have some concerns that he doesn’t think are illegitimate, some of which have been “hitched,” sort of, to the process issue. He never mentions the motion that we passed at the December Faculty Council meeting, a motion that was highly relevant to the Board’s deliberations; he does not provide the substance of Arts Council’s concerns. Could he possibly have presented a weaker version of our position? Is it likely that members of the Board of Governors would be concerned at this point about the impractical concerns of a bunch of trouble-makers who clearly don’t have the respect of their own Dean? In any case, the Dean’s final message was to forget about process and to forget about any referral to Senate, because Senate was, he claimed, a “poisoned” venue—poisoned, presumably by the interventions of Senators from Arts attempting to defend Faculty Council’s position on this matter.

The following week, on February 6th, 2008, Senate considered a motion brought by Arts Senators to request formally that the Administration submit the academic provisions of the Navitas agreement to Senate. This motion was consistent with the Arts Council motion of December 18th. At Arts Caucus before the Senate meeting, Susan Prentice, who had attended the Board of Governors meeting as an observer, objected to the fact that the Dean had not mentioned the Arts Council motion at the Board of Governors meeting, and the Dean admitted that this had been an unfortunate oversight. Professor Prentice expressed her unhappiness about this failure. The Dean accordingly knew at this point how profoundly dissatisfied Arts Senators were with his representation of our position; he knew that we thought that the Board of Governors’ vote of January 29th was based on incomplete information. At the Senate meeting, he nevertheless invoked this same Board of Governors’ vote, a vote that he had influenced, as a reason for Senate to defeat the motion before it. In this same statement before the Senate, he clearly misrepresented what had happened in Arts Council on December 18, 2007 and he misrepresented the continuing level of profound concern in the Faculty of Arts. I draw your attention to the excerpt from the minutes of the Senate meeting of February 6, 2008. Unfortunately, we have no verbatim transcript of that meeting, because the meeting had to be moved from Senate chambers at short notice because of an alarm in the Engineering Complex. As a result, the debate was not tape-recorded, as it usually is. The minutes are very truncated and not entirely accurate. I can tell you that Mark Gabbert, Susan Prentice, and I had all spoken before the Dean spoke. In debates of this nature in Senate – that is, ones over controversial issues that many people want to speak to – you are recognized only once by the Chair. There was, in other words, no way for us to challenge the Dean’s comments. I had spoken shortly before the Dean, and I had pointed out that Professor Gabbert’s motion reflected the feelings and concerns of Arts Faculty Council, which had passed a motion similar to the one we were voting on at Senate, and that the vote had been virtually unanimous, *nem. con* with one
abstention. When the Dean spoke minutes later, he diminished the force of this representation of Arts concerns by recasting the vote as having passed by a majority. These words are not in the minutes, but I remember them very distinctly. The Dean then said “but a lot of information has come out since then,” clearly implying that, since the vote, some of that “majority” had been satisfied with what they had learned since. No one I have spoken to, and I have spoken to many, many of my colleagues in Arts about this matter, has been in the least placated by anything that has emerged since that December meeting. Most people are more convinced than ever that this matter should have been submitted to the Senate for its consideration.

In the course of discussions over Navitas, the Dean of Arts and other Administrators have insisted many times over that we should respect the Administration, respect the decision of the Board of Governors, respect the Vice-President Academic, respect the President. It would behoove the Administration, the Board of Governors, the Vice-President Academic, the President to respect Arts Faculty Council. We are not a mob of malcontents, of trouble-makers. We are a highly educated and responsible group of people who take our commitment to the mission of this University seriously. We have a long-standing tradition of lively engagement in collegial governance that we believe is crucial to the health of both the Faculty and the University as a whole. It behooves the Dean of this Faculty to respect us, to speak of us respectfully in public venues. It behooves him to recognize that when he speaks, he inevitably speaks as the Dean of Arts, with the authority that a Dean has. He is the official voice of the Faculty, and he has a collegial responsibility to the members of this Faculty to represent our concerns, the substance of those concerns, and our formally expressed positions fairly, accurately and completely.”

Dean’s Response

Dr. Richard Sigurdson indicated that he thinks that technically he has done nothing that would warrant something as severe as a censure motion in Arts Faculty Council.

He indicated that he did what he was asked to do by Council at the December 18, 2007 meeting – he wrote to the President in detail about what transpired at the meeting and included a copy of the draft minutes. He indicated in that letter that there was virtually no support expressed for Navitas at the meeting and the significant concerns about the process.

In response to the criticism for not speaking at the Senate meeting in January 2008, Dr. Sigurdson indicated that Navitas was not on the agenda at that meeting and moreover, Mark Gabbert rose fairly early on and presented a notice of motion similar to the one presented at Arts Faculty Council that would be discussed at the next Senate meeting. He added that he is not the only Senator who did not speak about Navitas at that meeting and, in fact, some Arts Senators have never spoken at Senate at all.
In response to the criticism about his actions or inactions at the Board of Governors meeting, the Dean indicated that he is a member of the Board because he was elected in an open seat by Senate, not because of his position as Dean of Arts. He has been Dean of Arts since 2004 and a member of the board only since 2007. He indicated that he would encourage members of Senate to provide a notice of motion of censure at Senate if they feel he did not present their views well at the Board of Governors. He indicated that he felt that at the Board meeting he covered the concerns of Arts faculty members and Senators by raising many concerns about Navitas.

At the following meeting of Senate, Dr. Sigurdson indicated that a Senator spoke to the unanimous (less one abstention) vote held at Arts Faculty Council and he spoke afterwards confirming the vote and went on to justify the vote he was going to cast. Dr. Gabbert’s motion to send the Navitas proposal back to Senate for review was defeated. Many people voted in favour of the motion, but a few more voted against it. Dr. Sigurdson indicated that he spoke following a number of Arts Senators (Dr. Gabbert, Dr. Young, Dr. Prentice) and he doesn’t think there was a Senator in attendance who did not understand the issue.

Dr. Sigurdson reiterated that on the technical motion of censure against him, it is quite clear that he did not fail to carryout his responsibilities. He does, however, realize that in carrying out his responsibilities he did not express as vigorously, as strongly as he could have, the concerns raised by Arts faculty members and for that, he apologized. He indicated that a faculty member, for whom he has tremendous respect, mentioned to him that his actions are not normally something for which someone gets censured, but that the motion of censure is a reflection of the relationship he has with the Arts Faculty Council. It is a matter of accurately reflecting the tone, the volume, and the intensity of the concerns raised by Council. Dr. Sigurdson indicated that he has not always fully reflected the tone of Council and perhaps he does not always say it the way some people from Council would and finds it difficult to replicate that tone since it is not in his character. He apologized again for not working harder to show Council’s views including the intensity.

Dr. Sigurdson further indicated that he was in a no win situation and he voted the way he felt was necessary for the Faculty and the University. He stated that when he speaks at Senate or the Board of Governors, he supports his case for the way he will vote. He indicated that the transcript included with the motion of censure does not show what others at the Board meeting said and he added that he felt he covered both sides of the issue more then any other administrator at that meeting. He also indicated that as Dean, sometimes he must work in ways faculty members do not always see and cannot verify: at Deans’ and Directors’ Council meetings and in meetings with the President and Vice-Presidents. He said that he made clear the opposition to Navitas and indicated that he did not support the process and in no way does his not supporting the vote to send the Navitas documentation to Senate show that he did not support the view at all. At the time, he felt it would not be productive to send it to Senate.
Dr. Sigurdson spoke to the consequences of the action of censuring him. He indicated that he could not face a vote of non-confidence at Arts Faculty Council since he was appointed as Dean by the Board of Governors. Motion of censure in Parliament reflect a strong condemnation of a person’s speech and they tend to occur when people make hate speeches or act in a way that brings into disrepute the body or lies or misleads. In parliamentary tradition, a person saying someone misrepresented can be reprimanded by the Speaker by being asked to rephrase or by being sent out of the chamber. Dr. Sigurdson indicated that he is being accused of misrepresentation and that he has failed to represent the intensity of Council’s views. He feels that a motion of censure is serious and to him, it means a lot; if passed, he will carry that with him for his entire career. He asked Council if this was a censurable manner in the same way one would be censured for making a hate speech. He added that people outside of this Council meeting will not know the reasons for the censure. Dr. Sigurdson indicated that this motion of censure has consequences for the Faculty of Arts. He stated that he has worked since his arrival in 2004 to mend the serious divisions in the Faculty and heal the concerns and move forward. Just having this motion on the agenda has meant that for several weeks people have been talking. Perhaps those who put forward the motion thought it would be unifying – everyone against the Dean or the Administration. Already there have been divisions among departments and people are divided from department to department. Dr. Sigurdson indicated that he is troubled and saddened by this situation. He indicated that he bears and takes a certain responsibility for this situation because of his inability to express as openly as he should have. He added, though, that those who have brought forward this motion also share the responsibility for the division this has caused in the Faculty.

Dr. Sigurdson stated that this has been unpleasant and difficult for him, but he asked Council what this would mean for the next Dean. Who would want to be Dean of the Faculty of Arts after this? It will certainly set up a precedent that potential Deans will think about before becoming Dean of this Faculty. Perhaps the next Dean will be one that will do whatever the strongest voice says, but that would not be successful with the Administration in furthering the goals of the Faculty.

Dr. Sigurdson added that the final consequence, for those who wish to vote for the motion in order to send a message to the current administration, is that perceptions outside of this room about the vote cannot be controlled. There is only one chance to make a first impression… is this the first impression you wish to make on the incoming President, Dr. Barnard?

Dr. Sigurdson stated that he understands that some people view, accurately sometimes, that he is frustrated with Arts Faculty Council and the processes in place in Arts. He indicated that the Faculty needs to work on creating a more positive environment and culture and he apologized if he has set the Faculty back on that front. He added that members of the Faculty must work together to avoid sending negative messages. A censure motion does not fit this crime and Council should consider long and hard whether, as a Faculty, it wishes to relay this type of
message. Dr. Sigurdson indicated that he is willing to accept either outcome of the vote.

Discussion of the Motion

Dr. Tim Anna indicated that the people who have brought the motion forward are deeply concerned about the future of the Faculty. He stated that he has never experienced a Dean of Arts who has so thoroughly and completely failed to respond to a request from Arts Faculty Council. The 5 previous Deans of Arts sometimes, at very great cost to themselves, encouraged the collegial model in this faculty. Other Deans have spoken against policy proposals by the Administration; their first choice was to speak on behalf of the Faculty of Arts. Members of the Faculty of Arts are concerned about maintaining the long tradition of the collegial governance model. The present Dean of Arts isn’t part of this history and has failed to notice this very great collegial tradition.

Dr. David Martin indicated that he thinks the movers of the motion have made a very good and extremely strong point, but it does not reach the threshold for censure. Dr. Martin indicated that the point has been made and that he would vote against the motion.

Dr. Harvey Keselman made the following comments:

“I would like to speak against this motion to censure the Dean of Arts. The stated thrust of this motion to censure the Dean is that, because he did not communicate or accurately communicate the Faculty Council vote of December 2007 on the matter of the Navitas/ICM agreement at the meetings of Senate and the Board, he did not fairly, accurately, and completely represent the position of Arts Council.

The Dean did, as he just indicated, precisely what Faculty Council requested of him. He was not asked to communicate this motion to either Senate or the Board of Governors but, rather, to the President and to the University Secretary, which he did and did so in a very timely fashion. Dean Sigurdson has already indicated that he may not have explicitly pointed out at these meetings the precise manner in which Arts Council voted on this manner.

At each of these meetings, however and, indeed, in other ways, he went to great lengths to ensure that the views and concerns of the Faculty of Arts were heard on the Navitas/International College of Manitoba matter.

As indicated in the minutes of both the January and February meetings of Senate, the Dean referenced the concerns of members of the Faculty of Arts as well as the Faculty’s view that this agreement should be considered an academic matter by Senate.

At the February meeting of the Board of Governors, the Dean went to great lengths to underscore the serious reservations of the Faculty of Arts.
In my view, at each of the meetings of the University’s governing bodies, the Dean clearly indicated that members of the Faculty of Arts had serious concerns, that these concerns were legitimate, and that they should be recognized by the Board and the Administration.

At the Board of Governor’s meeting, in particular, he spoke at some length about the nature of these concerns in order to ensure that members understood them and were aware of them.

I feel confident that, based on the Dean’s commentary at these meetings, members of both Senate and the Board understood very well that the Faculty of Arts had serious concerns about the Navitas/International College of Manitoba agreement.

In my view then, a motion to censure the Dean, based on the fact that he may not have explicitly referenced an Arts Council vote on this matter, is entirely unjustified:

With respect to the December 18th, 2007 motion of this Council, he did precisely what he was asked to do, that is, he communicated this Council’s motion of the Navitas matter, along with the vote on this motion, to the University Secretary and the President.

And, at each meeting of Senate and the Board where this matter was raised, he clearly and in some detail articulated the concerns of this Faculty on this matter.

While the impetus for the motion to censure the Dean is stated as the Dean’s failure to explicitly reference the Arts Council vote on the Navitas/International College of Manitoba matter, in my view, the real ‘driver’ behind this motion is that fact that, at both the Senate and Board meetings, the dean voted against motions to refer the Navitas/International College of Manitoba matter back to Senate. Had Dean Sigurdson voted in favour of these motions, I doubt that we would be here today considering this motion of censure.

Here again, at meetings of Arts Council, Senate, and the Board, the Dean has been clear about the basis for his decisions and actions. He has indicated that, as an officer of the University, he must take decisions and act in what he believes are the best interests of the Faculty of Arts and the University as a whole.

Moreover, as a member of the University’s Board of Governors, his fiduciary responsibilities are “to make informed judgments and vote in the best interests of the University as a whole” and “to maintain an overriding loyalty to the entire University, rather than to any part of it or constituency within or outside of the University”.
On the Navitas/International College of Manitoba matter, I have every confidence that, in casting his votes on this difficult and contentious issue, Dean Sigurdson did so with the best interest of the Faculty and the University as a whole at heart.

While some here may disagree that the position that he has taken on this matter is, in fact, in the best interests of the Faculty and University as a whole, I believe that we must respect his right to take these decisions and to do so in a manner that is consistent with his institutional obligations.

For these reasons, I will be voting against this motion to censure Dean Sigurdson and would urge others to do the same.”

Dr. Raymond Perry indicated that he has sat through a number of Deans’ stewardships and recalled a number of nasty episodes. He indicated that the message has been sent loud and clear about Navitas. But, in the issues that the Faculty has dealt with in the past, there are many messier and more unpleasant issues. In view of the substance of this motion, Dr. Perry thought that it is not of that substance. He indicated that he would vote against the motion.

Dr. Mark Whitmore indicated that he was at Faculty Council on his own initiative. He stated that the position of Dean, the role of Dean, is a great job. But sometimes it is tough and the toughest parts are the perceived conflicts of what the Faculty wants, versus what the Administration wants, versus what you think is right. He further stated that as Deans of Arts and Science, issues always affect these faculties, these cases must be dealt with and the Dean must try to make the right decision. Dr. Whitmore said that Dean Sigurdson is grappling with his conflict between representing the Faculty and what the Dean thinks is actually best for the Faculty and for the University. Deans must often decide whether disagreements with the Senior Administration should be dealt with publicly or privately. Dr. Whitmore indicated that he has been in meetings where Dr. Sigurdson has made very clear the position of Arts on Navitas. He indicated that the message of Council has been delivered and he encouraged members to vote against the motion.

Dr. Radhika Desai indicated that she is uneasy given the implication is that things are to be dealt with privately. University governance is to be a collegial matter and collegiality only happens with openness. If members are not fully informed then we cannot partake in governance.

Dr. Ristock asked the Rules and Procedures Committee members if persons could hand in ballots for the motion of censure ahead of time? The Rules and Procedures Committee indicated that members can only vote if they are present at the time of the vote.

Ms. Aimée Pochinko indicated that she is in attendance to convey the opinion of the Arts Student Body Council (ASBC). The ASBC, at a meeting held after the notice of motion was made, passed a motion supporting the censure. 14 ASBC
members voted for the motion, while 1 member was opposed. There was 1 abstention.

Dr. Marek Debicki indicated that this discussion is about what academics expect from their Dean. Faculty members have an expectation that he is our leader and speaks for us. As Dean, he is a colleague. There are points where the leader can disagree with the majority, but he must convince the majority that he or she is right. Regarding the motion of censure, Arts Faculty Council is the wrong forum for that kind of debate. Dr. Debicki urged the Dr. Sigurdson to think to what extent the Dean should be a leader of the Faculty.

Dr. John Loxley indicated that his objection to the Dean’s actions lies in his lack of commitment to the Faculty and, in his opinion, the way the Dean voted at Senate and at the Board of Governors shows that. In his opinion, Council is not asking to support one segment of the University over the University as a whole. Rather, the Dean had a responsibility to steer this issue through Senate for its thorough scrutiny. Dr. Loxley indicated his concern for the Dean’s lack of commitment to collegiality. Dr. Loxley supported the motion of censure.

Dr. Laura Brown stated that the Dean has presented his position and she does not see it as obsequious. She noted that Dr. Sigurdson has struggled very seriously with difficult issues. Although Council does not approve of the way he voted, in her opinion his behaviour has not risen anywhere near the level for censure. Dr. Brown wondered about the motivation behind the motion to censure the Dean since a secret meeting that included senior UMFA members was held to work towards this motion and later Senators were brought into the picture. Dr. Brown indicated that members of Council must be less quick to censure and more open to interaction.

Dr. Arlene Young contested Dr. Brown’s comment indicating that the notice of censure of motion involved many people who were in attendance at Senate. The meeting was an Ad Hoc meeting and was neither inclusive nor exclusive. Brenda Austin-Smith provided the information of what had transpired at the Board of Governors meeting. There was no movement by UMFA.

Dr. Mark Gabbert specified that what had started this whole process was a move on the part of the University Administration that presented a fundamental assault on this institution for Senate to exercise its rights. There were a number of questions raised here, but the one motion that came on December 18th was to refer the matter to Senate and its committees in order to make their decisions. Dr. Gabbert stated that he deeply resents the idea that there is some sinister ulterior motive. Dr. Gabbert further noted that at the January meeting of Senate, there was a discussion about Navitas, and in fact, the President had made a Powerpoint presentation on the agreement. Dr. Gabbert indicated that, in reply to a question, the President said that a copy of the agreement would not be provided to Senate and he then made a notice of motion to request the materials. Dr. Gabbert stated that, in the meantime, on January 29, there was a Board of Governors meeting held where a motion to refer Navitas to Senate was considered. Dr. Gabbert pointed out that it is not that the Dean could not find enough intensity at the Board
of Governors meeting, it is that he never conveyed to the Board that the Arts Faculty Council had voted *nem con* with one abstention to refer the matter to Senate. He added that it is clear that the matter of the motion of December 18th was not properly carried out by the Dean. Those who proposed the motion are aware of the seriousness of this matter and a point must be made about collegial governance.

Dr. Harvey Keselman pointed out that the motion that was introduced at Senate by Mark Gabbert was defeated. With regards to the Board of Governors, Dr. Keselman reminded Council members that the Dean, as a member of the Board, has a responsibility to the whole University, not to a smaller entity. Dr. Keselman added that at the Board meeting, Dr. Sigurdson spoke generally about 3 concerns: one about process, one about labour-related issues, one about implementation issues. He added that Dr. Sigurdson had indicated that all three concerns were legitimate and spoke quite strongly about the concerns of the Faculty of Arts and Dr. Sigurdson had spoken clearly and definitively about the concerns of Arts Faculty Council.

Dr. Laura Brown apologized for erroneously stating that Brenda Austin-Smith had called a secret meeting of Senior UMFA members and that she stands corrected.

A vote was taken, ballots were deposited into the ballot box and Gerry Friesen and Lise Durand left Council chambers to tally the votes.

**MOTION** (T. Anna/T. Chen): that item 7 (a) be considered prior to item 5.

*CARRIED*

(7) **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

(a) **Nominations and Elections for Senate and Arts Standing Committees**

**MOTION** (L. Wilson/J. Ristock): that Lori Wilkinson be added to the ballot for the Academic Regulations Policy Committee.

*CARRIED*

**MOTION** (G. MacLean/J. Ristock): that the following persons be added to the Local Discipline Committee ballot:

- Laura Brown (Economics) for the term July 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008
- Michael Kinnear (History) for the term July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009

*CARRIED*

**MOTION** (L. Wilson/A. Osborne): that Rory Egan be stricken from the Rules and Procedures Committee ballot (as he is already a member) and that, rather then act as a leave replacement for David Pentland, Sonia Bookman (Sociology) be added to the ballot to replace Rory Egan.

*CARRIED*
MOTION (M. Debicki/G. MacLean): that Marian Morry be added to the Teaching Excellence Committee ballot.

CARRIED

The vote was taken and ballots were placed into the ballot box.


The Dean indicated that this report was circulated for information.

(6) REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

(a) Arts Endowment Fund Committee: Meeting of February 28, 2008

Lori Wilkinson (Sociology) spoke to the Endowment Fund report. She added that Greg Smith (History) will chair the Endowment Fund Committee for 2008-2009.

(b) Arts Nominating Committee: Meeting of March 13, 2008

Since the Chair of the Nominating Committee, Robert Hoppa, was not at the meeting, the Dean indicated that the report was circulated for information.

(c) Arts Equity, Diversity and Human Rights Committee: Meetings of February 25 and March 10, 2008

On behalf of the EDHR Committee, Marian Morry reported that:

- The Committee has been working on revising its terms of reference. Part of this process has involved examining the points raised in the Employment Systems Review report to determine which items should be part of the mandate and which are or should be the responsibility of someone else (e.g. the Dean, University Equity Office, etc…). Related to the terms of reference, the Committee is determining which items are necessary for the Federal Contractors Program to ensure that they are dealt with in a timely fashion. The Committee is aiming to bring the terms of reference to the next Arts Faculty Council meeting.

- Drs. Laura Brown, Susan Prentice, and Elizabeth Troutt have agreed to compile an analysis of the Faculty of Arts related to issues of career progression and more specifically salary, tenure, and promotion. This analysis will likely focus on gender differences – to be determined by the data itself.

- Equity Services has indicated that funding should be available to hire a research assistant to assist with data collection. Funding is conditional upon:
  - the Dean’s Office providing some funding;
  - the sharing of the process (not the data) with Equity Services so that other faculties can also do this type of analysis.

- Louise Giesbrecht, Employment Equity Officer, provided an in-service to the EDHR Committee. She indicated that the Faculty of Arts’ Employment
Systems Review report and process were the best she has seen from across the faculties.

- The EDHR will begin a review of the tenure, promotion, and evaluation document with an eye to equity. Any revisions will be brought to Faculty Council.

(7) **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

(b) **Proposal for a New Arts Standing Committee: Local Area Health and Safety Committee**

Dean Sigurdson spoke to the merits of the proposed Committee, which aims to comply with provincial legislation passed in 2006.

**MOTION** (R. Wilson/J. Ristock): that the proposed Local Area Health and Safety Committee membership and terms of reference be approved as circulated.

*CARRIED*

**Report on the Motion of Censure**

Janice Ristock assumed the Chair and reported the following results of the vote on the motion of censure: For – 76, Against – 48, Abstentions – 6

*CARRIED*

**MOTION** (R. O’Kell/M. Debicki): that Arts Faculty Council invite the new President, Dr. David Barnard, to come and speak to Council on the subject of his views on 'collegial governance.'

*CARRIED*

(8) **QUESTION PERIOD**

There were no questions for Question Period.

(9) **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.