

Attendance: J. Kalra (Chair). See appendix A for listing of members in attendance.

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

A tribute to Professor Emeritus Paul Riemer was delivered by Professor Jim Kells, Professor and Head of the Department of Civil and Geological Engineering. Professor Riemer was a professor in the College of Engineering for 40 years, retiring in 1988, and was an emeritus professor of Civil Engineering. He passed away on July 26, 2012.

1. Adoption of the agenda

The secretary drew members' attention to a typographical error in the circulated agenda—the word “and” should be inserted into the last sentence of the first paragraph of item 8.1, so that it reads “members in attendance and voting” rather than “members in attendance voting.”

DOBSON/KULSHRESHRA: That the agenda be adopted as circulated, with the amendment noted.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra welcomed members to the first meeting of the 18th year of the university's representative Council, and in particular welcomed President Busch-Vishniac to her first meeting as president. He extended a welcome as well to other new members of Council, then introduced chairs of the Council's standing committees and provided a brief overview of the work of the Council, expressing thanks to all members for their service. He noted that today's meeting includes an unprecedented motion to reconsider a decision taken at an earlier meeting, at the request of the General Academic Assembly. He also gave notice of his intention to turn the chair over to Professor John Rigby, vice-chair of Council, for item 8.1 on the agenda.

3. Minutes of the meeting of June 21, 2012

DAUM SHANKS/SINGH: That the minutes of the meeting of June 21, 2012 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

4. Business arising from the minutes

No business was identified as arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the president

Dr. Busch-Vishniac commended members to her written report and took the opportunity to make some preliminary remarks about her first impressions following almost three months as president. She noted the beauty of the campus and excellence of its facilities, the friendliness of the people, and the energy of the students. She also commented on the vibrancy of Saskatoon as a city, and the pride that the graduates of this university clearly take in their university. She then enumerated a

few challenges facing the university including impending reductions in the level of support from the provincial government and the importance this places on the president's making a case for strategic investment in higher education, particularly for a university in a 'have' province at a time when strategic investment could lead to dramatic improvements in quality relative to competitor institutions. Dr. Busch-Vishniac also referenced the need for attention to be paid to developments in the College of Medicine, including why having a college of medicine matters to a university and to a province, both in academic terms and in economic terms. She spoke of what makes a great medical school, and the interactions and interdependency of research, teaching and administrative service, as well as the additional requirement in medical schools for clinical service. She indicated the responsibility that the entire institution, including Council, has to help the College of Medicine to be successful in all of these facets of its work, as well as the importance of working with the Health Regions.

The chair then invited members of Council to ask questions or make comments.

A member of Council asked about the motivations for the upcoming review of the College of Graduate Studies and Research, and (without prejudging the outcomes) what the university might expect to see as a result of such a review. The president observed that with a change of leadership there is always an opportunity for reflection on the model, noting that the university's current model for oversight of graduate programs is unusual for this day and age, and that key questions to be asked will include broad questions about the role of a graduate studies office, how our peer institutions perform this function, and whether there are processes that serve as roadblocks that were never intended to be roadblocks.

6. Report of the provost

The chair then invited Provost Brett Fairbairn to present his report. Dr. Fairbairn drew members' attention to his written report, referencing particularly the choices the university will be initiating in both financial and academic matters this year, and the status of implementation of the priorities identified in IP3's areas of focus.

6.1 Progress report on Organizational Restructuring in the College of Medicine

Dr. Fairbairn reminded Council that a report on restructuring is being presented at the request of Council pursuant to the motion approved at the May 17 meeting. He referenced the work that has been done over the summer to compile statistical information and invited the dean to add any comments he might have. Dr. Qualtiere supplemented the report with a summary of a discussion taken at a meeting the previous day at which the terms of reference were discussed. He referenced a strong recommitment on the part of the dean's advisory committee to work with the faculty council to meet the objectives of the restructuring. He also indicated that the working groups are now largely constituted, and that there is an expectation that it will be possible to move forward fairly quickly without a lot of change of the direction to the course that has been set over the past few months.

The chair then invited questions and comments from members of Council on any aspect of the provost's report.

A member asked about the status of construction of the Gordon Oakes-Red Bear Student Centre. The president responded as executive sponsor of the project to say that a tender will be put out within the next two weeks and that her expectation would be that a shovel will be in the ground for this project before the ground freezes.

7. Student societies reports

7.1 Report from the USSU

USSU President Jared Brown and academic affairs Vice-president Ruvimbo Kanyemba presented an oral report on their recent activities. These included the following:

- Jared has been familiarizing himself with the role and work expected of him as a member of the board of governors.
- The USSU has been working with Vice-dean David Parkinson on a project to circulate artwork in Place Riel.
- Ruvimbo has been working with the teaching and learning committee on linking undergraduate students with research and service opportunities.
- Various events such as Hike Bike and Roll and the Mayoral debate have been held.
- Work is being done to consolidate resources related to clubs and streamline and facilitate processes for club ratification and recruitment of members.
- The USSU will be working with the city this fall to establish a summer U-Pass program.
- Research is being done on the idea of a social justice centre.
- Elections will take place for 10 vacant places on the student council and the senate by the middle of October.

The chair invited questions. A member of Council stepped forward to present the students with a gift of tobacco wrapped in red cloth and put together with twine, and explained the significance of each element of the gift. She thanked the students for their gift of putting their skills to use for the benefit of others by running for office. She provided a similar gift to the president to welcome her to our university.

Another member congratulated Mr. Brown on his election as USSU president. He referred to a recent Aboriginal strategy meeting that was held at the English River site; this was an excellent initiative but he would like the USSU president and the provost and president to reconsider the arrangement of having their outreach offices in such a remote location, since this may present a barrier for students and others who do not have vehicles to get to English River.

The chair of Council thanked the students and echoed his congratulations to Jared for his election as the USSU president.

7.2 Report from the Graduate Students' Association

GSA President Ehimai Ohiozebau presented an oral report from the Graduate Students' Association. He spoke of the strategic direction-setting that the GSA executive has been doing to establish short, medium and long term goals. Among their priorities are the following:

- to ensure efficient child care service on campus both by collaborating with the university and also by initiating their own processes;
- to have a GSA award night as a social event for graduate students, faculty and management, most likely in March;
- to plan a number of events during the fall term in the Graduate Commons to make sure students identify with the location. These will include themed events around topics such as mining, energy, health sciences, and community-based learning;

- to give out GSA needs-based bursaries with help from matching funds from CGSR, increasing the base to support up to 40 students this year;
- to partner with CGSR to create more awareness of expectations for graduate students.

Mr. Ohiozebau also reported on the success of the annual orientation that was held the first week of September; he thanked the president and the dean of CGSR for attending, noting that the response from students was overwhelming and feedback was positive.

The chair invited members to join him in thanking members of both the USSU and GSA executives, and provided his assurances that the Council will continue to work collaboratively with the student leadership.

8. Planning and Priorities Committee

8.1 Request for decision: College of Medicine Organizational Restructuring

The chair then called on Professor John Rigby to assume the chair, citing a potential conflict of interest because the next item concerns his own college. Dr. Rigby began by echoing the chair's words of welcome to the president. He indicated that the coordinating committee of Council had sought legal advice about how to properly carry out the requirements of the Act with respect to a motion to reconsider its May 17 motion, and that the advice received was unequivocal that the motion must be presented in the same form as presented on May 17. Thus any motion to amend, refer, rescind or otherwise change the original motion will not be considered to be in order. Professor Rigby then indicated that the original mover and seconder would be invited to make both introductory and concluding remarks, followed by comments from the president, the dean of medicine, and the chair of the faculty council of the College of Medicine, before the floor is opened to questions. He also reminded Council members that in accordance with the *University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995*, a 2/3 majority of those present and voting is required to reconfirm the motion.

Professor Rigby then invited Professor Robert Tyler to present this item as chair of the planning and priorities committee. Professor Tyler reiterated that as a consequence of the outcome of the special meeting of the General Academic Assembly held on September 6, 2012, and in accordance with the *University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995* [71(8)], this motion must be submitted to Council for confirmation, and that it requires a two-thirds majority of Council members in attendance and voting to confirm the original motion. He noted that this motion is being returned to the Council floor from the planning and priorities committee but that the committee had not come to a recommendation on the motion and that it therefore does not come forward with 'it is recommended' at the front of it.

Professor Rigby then invited the provost, as the seconder of the motion, to comment. The provost emphasized that a far-reaching change to the structure of the College of Medicine is critical to its success; he characterized the current clinical research and teaching model as being broken. He described the arrangement that has been proposed by the president as a renewed opportunity for faculty within the college to contribute to the solution, but warned that this will not be an easy conversation because there will be implications for employment arrangements and there is potential for conflict. He reiterated that university Council alone has the authority and responsibility to approve the structure of the college. He also indicated that he would be seconding the motion as a way to bring it to the floor of Council, but that he would be voting against it, since he sees taking it off the books as the best way to give the college the space it needs, until the end of the calendar year. Nevertheless, it is both urgent and important, not just for the College but for the university, that a solution be found.

Professor Rigby then invited the president to speak. Dr. Busch-Vishniac indicated she would be providing further information and context for what has been a fluid situation. Like the provost she is recommending a 'no' vote on the motion that is before Council today, although like him she wants to be clear about the urgent need for change. She pointed out that in Canada, only two medical schools have been on probation in the last 15 years. Although the University of Saskatchewan medical program is at present fully accredited, it has been put on a warning of probation. The president outlined her own thoughts about the usefulness of accreditation, which ensures only a minimum standard and does not assure a high quality. Thus probationary status signals a clear warning that the minimum acceptable standard is not being met and constitutes an important wake-up call. She expressed her own reaction to the threatened loss of accreditation as one of shock and embarrassment, and warned that such an outcome would cause the people and government of Saskatchewan to lose faith in the institution and would make it nearly impossible to recruit good students and for grant applications to meet with any chance of success. The current structure, by not vesting authority where it needs to be, means that the trail of accountability is often faint or invisible and that as a result even a mundane assignment of duties is difficult for the dean to negotiate with people who are on full academic salaries. This and the fact that our students are performing poorly on national exams provoked the difficult meetings that took place throughout May.

The president noted that following the outcome of the GAA meeting in September, the university was on track for an extremely contentious Council meeting today that would have seen Council being asked to impose a solution on a faculty that did not want it. This kind of impasse, she said, cannot lead to success. She explained that she had therefore chosen to call a meeting of the leaders of the vested parties to determine whether there might be a better approach to the problem, one that would garner support but still accomplish the change that must happen. She expressed her belief in the value of shared faculty governance and in consultation, and stressed that there has never been any intent to disparage the clinical skills of the college's faculty. Nevertheless, it has been clear that the heavy emphasis on clinical service, and inadequate attention to research and education, are symptomatic of a lack of balance. Dr. Busch-Vishniac stressed the need to partner with the health regions to move to a more conventional medical school model.

In describing the meeting that took place with the vested parties, the president explained that she had presented a proposition that she would withdraw central administrative support for the original May 17 motion at Council if the dean's advisory committee in the College of Medicine would come forward with a plan that had certain characteristics including addressing accreditation concerns within 12 months, redressing the balance of teaching, research and service over a five-year period, actively engaging the faculty of the College in crafting the plan, and defining evidence-based measures to be shared with Council. This must be accomplished without additional funding from the university beyond that already committed. At the meeting it was agreed that if an acceptable alternative did not come forward at the December university Council meeting, then the original motion or something similar to it would be returned for Council's consideration. After lengthy discussion the parties at the table agreed to this approach and it was communicated to faculty in the college. Dr. Busch-Vishniac advised that she still has some serious misgivings about this plan, particularly since the university's governance does not require the engagement or approval of a faculty in its own restructuring, because this would necessarily involve conflicts of interest. However, she expressed a willingness to give the faculty the opportunity they seek to provide input into which of several options might be the least uncomfortable.

In closing, the president congratulated the provost, vice-provost Phillipson, and acting dean Qualtiere for their courageous work on this file, indicating that the work they have done will serve as a useful guide for the college's faculty and leadership as they consider alternatives. She thanked Council and its committees and the dean's advisory committee for their diligence in working towards a solution, and observed that it is a great tribute to everyone at the institution that this debate has spanned many months but has remained civil and orderly.

Finally, the president reiterated her intention to vote 'no' on the motion and urged members to vote with their conscience.

The chair then invited the acting dean to address Council.

Dr. Qualtiere indicated that he too would most likely vote against the original motion. He stressed that the opportunity presented by the president's agreement offers a unique opportunity to break a stalemate where the dean's advisory committee was trying to put in place a restructuring that was resisted by many faculty. He reported that since the agreement has been reached, he has heard from many faculty that they welcome re-engaging in the process, and also reported that the dean's advisory committee believes that the president has done the right thing for the right reasons and supports the proposal. Having said this, he acknowledged that the mission ahead for the college will be difficult, and that the college is in an even more difficult position than in May. While the college can use the thinking and work already done to move forward with a proper restructuring plan, many of the changes will involve personal situations for individual faculty members—however he expressed confidence that arriving at a revised concept paper is doable.

The chair then invited Dr. Tom Wilson, chair of the College of Medicine faculty council, to speak to the motion.

Dr. Wilson referenced the two goals of faculty council of the college: to increase faculty engagement and participation and to remove the constraint of the three-division model as it was published in the concept paper. He echoed the acting dean's observation that the previous day's meeting with the dean's advisory committee had been productive, and abbreviated the agreement that had been reached with the president as ARENA: Accreditation, Rebalancing, Evidence, and "No Argent." He echoed Dr. Qualtiere's sense that the goal is achievable, and described the time line towards the goal, including a special meeting of the college faculty council on November 21 to receive interim reports of the various working groups, with November 28 being the final meeting of faculty council (to which the president will be invited) and December as the deadline for a final proposal, so that it can be sent to university Council in time for its December meeting. [Members please note that meeting is scheduled for December 20—*secretary*]

The chair then invited questions and comments from the floor.

A new member asked for a brief rationale, for the benefit of new members of the proposal put forward in the concept paper, including how the proposed structure would help the medical school address its issues.

In responding, the provost spoke to the relationship between issues and structures, noting that in this case accreditation concerns have identified accountability as an issue, and that on the research side the proposed structure is designed to address matters such as the number of research-intensive positions and the supports and incentives for research performance, as well as how these align with the academic goals of teaching. Vice-provost Phillipson added that

the array of working groups is reflective of each of the areas the structure is intended to address.

There was a supplementary question about whether faculty members have to be in divisions, and whether creating separate divisions for research, education and clinical service might create barriers between these three interrelated activities. Vice-provost Phillipson responded that these functions are not intended to be silos but rather to signify the balance that must be achieved among them.

A council member from the College of Medicine suggested that the focus of what Council approves in December should be on goals rather than on structure, and asked that Council ensure that any criteria that the planning and priorities committee uses to evaluate a proposal coming forward from the dean's advisory committee should also be applied to alternatives that are advanced in its place. He also suggested that some of the most important issues before the college may not be within the power and authority of the university to solve, but may be rooted in the political objectives and priorities of government. In response, it was pointed out that the dean's advisory committee includes advisors from the health region and the government.

Dr. Bennet, the vice-chair of the College of Medicine faculty council urged members to follow the lead of the president and vice-provost, indicating that he could report that the enthusiasm and interest among faculty in his own department to participate in the renewal of the college has increased tenfold, and as a physician he believes that this leads to a good prognosis.

Professor Tyler responded briefly as chair of the planning and priorities committee to the concern raised about the criteria for evaluation of proposals. He confirmed that the criteria being developed by his committee must reflect the outcomes that the university needs to achieve and that they will be used to measure the acceptability of any plan that comes forward.

Both the mover and seconder waived their right for final comments.

TYLER/FAIRBAIRN: That university Council approve a new academic governance model for the College of Medicine, along with consequential changes to Council's bylaws, which would see the establishment of three new divisions: the Division of Clinical Research, the Division of Medical Education, and the Division of Biomedical and Population Sciences, and the discontinuation of the existing models of clinical instruction and research, as outlined in the attached "Concept Paper", effective January 1, 2013.

AND that the provost and the dean of the College of Medicine report to university Council on progress made toward implementation of this new model at the September 2012 meeting of university Council and at regular intervals over the course of the 2012/13 academic year.

DEFEATED

Professor Rigby made brief comments on the significance of the decision just taken, and the process that led to it, for the life of the university and the College of Medicine. He reminded Council of the common goal shared by both Council and the college faculty council, which must be to make the University of Saskatchewan a better university today and tomorrow than it was yesterday. He urged all parties to work together in good faith to identify a way forward.

Dr. Kalra returned to the chair for this meeting.

9. Governance Committee

Professor Gordon Zello, chair of the governance committee, presented the next two items.

9.1 Request for Decision: Change to Council Bylaws re: Membership of the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition Faculty Council

ZELLO/ DOBSON: That Council approve the changes to the membership of the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition faculty council as outlined in the attachment.

CARRIED

9.2 Notice of Motion: Change to Council Bylaws re: Membership of the School of Environment and Sustainability

The following motion will be brought to the October meeting of the Council for decision:

[ZELLO/DOBSON] : That Council approve the membership of the School of Environment and Sustainability faculty council as outlined in the attachment.

10. Academic Programs Committee

Professor Roy Dobson, chair of the academic programs committee presented the following items for information:

10.1 Veterinary Medicine academic calendar change

10.2 English proficiency criteria clarification

11. Other business

A member raised a question about how Council informs its members about avenues of appeal open to them as the result of a motion of the Council, and particularly the avenue of requesting a special meeting of the GAA. He wondered whether people could be informed about this if there are contentious decisions taken by Council. The chair committed to taking his question back to the coordinating committee for discussion.

12. Question period

There were no questions.

13. Adjournment

PARKINSON/DesBRISAY: To adjourn the meeting.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.