

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Adoption of the agenda

URQUHART/BUTLER : To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra welcomed members and visitors to the December meeting of Council, reminding them of the usual procedures for debate and the seating arrangements for Council's business. He invited Council to turn to the business on the agenda.

3. Minutes of the meeting of November 15, 2012

KULSHRESHTHA /URQUHART: That the Council minutes of November 15, 2012 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

No business was identified as arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the President

President Busch-Vishniac raised two items in addition to those in her written report. In the first place, she noted for Council that in accordance with her promise at the last meeting she had provided information to the Teaching and Learning committee about studies that have examined the nexus between teaching and research. She noted that studies do not support the suggestion that research excellence leads to teaching excellence in an individual, nor do they show that research excellence precludes teaching excellence in a person. However, the work in this area suggests that students who engage with research perceive an increase in their learning outcomes.

In the second place, the president offered some comments on the item before Council concerning the College of Medicine. Affirming that the mission of the College is to train physicians for Saskatchewan, she enumerated the characteristics of a highly functioning medical school as weaving together excellence in teaching, research and clinical services. To the extent that these qualities are not in evidence in our current College, there is a need for a new vision. The president described the significant work that has been done in the College since September, and the opportunities that have been provided for involvement by all faculty, staff and students. She drew members' attention to the letter from the students that was provided in the agenda materials and that makes it clear in stark

terms that the institution is not meeting the educational needs of its students. She also described her growing appreciation of the critically important relationship between the College of Medicine and the university's partners in the province, particularly the health regions. She expressed optimism that the university is well on the way to identifying solutions with those key partners. While the vision paper before Council today does not fully address the requirements she set forth earlier in the year for rebalancing, addressing accreditation and defining appropriate metrics without the addition of internal funding, it nevertheless represents a very good start. The proof of whether or not all those issues will be addressed will come as we get deeper into implementation. Finally Dr. Busch-Vishniac acknowledged the work of the planning and priorities committee of Council, which has risen to the challenge of identifying criteria and assisting the College to situate its new vision within the larger work of the university, and wished members of Council a wonderful holiday season.

There were no questions from Council members.

## 6. Report of the Provost

Dr. Fairbairn commended members to his written report. He made a few additional comments by way of updates to items mentioned in the report:

- The Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning has begun consideration of a batch of proposals for funding from the Academic Priorities Fund, and will be concluding that consideration in January. About a dozen initiatives that were launched during the second planning cycle are seeking additional funding.
- The new year will see the institution embark on a major project of program prioritization that will aim to address an issue common to many universities, which tend to be overprogrammed for the resources available to them. Many universities have found ways to address this issue in an organized and transparent and participatory way by following an approach introduced by Robert Dickeson; his approach evaluates all activities supported by the operating budget against a set of defined criteria.
- The committee to review graduate education has had its first organizational meeting; the committee will be looking at the kind of research and information that should be collected and devising a communications plan for soliciting involvement and ideas.

Finally, the provost congratulated Dean Cecilia Reynolds on her recently announced appointment as deputy provost and associate vice-president of students at Memorial University of Newfoundland, and announced that Bob Regnier will assume the role of acting dean in the College of Education on January 1, 2013.

The chair invited comments and questions.

A member asked for an update on the status of the academic health sciences building construction, and received assurances from the provost that the Board of Governors and the university's funding partners are fully aware of the importance of the project and the schedule. The board is, however, extremely reluctant to incur additional debt for capital projects. It has given permission to proceed with the project, including A and B wing, conditional on satisfactory funding arrangements. The project planning team has done an extraordinary amount of work and has identified there are phases we must proceed with regardless of funding, but that subsequent phases may need to wait until the financial circumstances are clearer.

A member rose to thank the provost for the update on employee headcount and in particular the section of the report that addresses the extent to which regulation and accountability requirements drive the increase in administrative staff. He indicated that the reason he posed the question originally is that the requirement of regulation can be used as a justification for increases in resource allocation, but that it is important to be willing to press the question and look more deeply into what our real obligations are. The provost acknowledged the point and responded that while greater

regulation does add to overall workload, he cannot recall many examples, other than copyright, where specific expenditure was based on specific regulatory changes.

A member asked how much of the growth in staff and faculty indicated in the table was funded by the operating budget; the provost clarified that the chart refers exclusively to the operating budget, but includes both academic and non-academic staff. There was a related suggestion that it would be helpful if there were a more detailed breakdown by staff category indicating, for example, staff who support academic units, librarians, etc. The provost pointed out that sources of funding can obscure the picture—for example, the line item labeled ‘salaries and benefits’ is not the only place that salaries are reflected, since targeted funding (for example to the College of Medicine) often covers faculty and staff positions. He referred members to the piece published in the Star Phoenix this morning that shows that 75% of the university’s operating budget goes to compensation of employees in all forms--35% is to faculty, 33% to non-academic staff, 4% to senior administrators, and 3% to other categories such as sessional instructors, TAs, and research professionals. Vice-presidents Fowler and Fairbairn committed to providing further information based on these suggestions.

A visitor referenced the provost’s appeal, in his piece in the StarPhoenix, for understanding and support during times of fiscal restraint at the university. He expressed skepticism at the juxtaposition of an announcement of a \$44.5M budgetary shortfall followed closely by the announcement of \$50M in funding for a new global food security institute. While acknowledging that the latter initiative is hugely important, he suggested it would be better if this funding had been internally generated and had gone through collegial oversight. The provost reminded the visitor and members of Council that full information about the university’s budget and the budget adjustment process can be found on the web site at [www.usask.ca/finances](http://www.usask.ca/finances). He pointed out that the \$44.5M represents an *annual* deficit in the operating budget, which goes to support core activities and derives from an annual government grant, annual tuition fees, and annual grants from other sources. The operating budget represents the money directly under the university’s control; the deficit is structural and must be addressed. On the other hand, the \$50M announced in support of the global food security institute is one-time funding tied to a particular purpose, though as it happens the university will be able to use some of that one-time funding to hire more faculty and to teach more classes. The provost addressed the question of collegial oversight by affirming the university’s commitment to collegial input into the university’s budgetary processes through the Planning and Priority Committee’s involvement and through Council’s role in development of the multi-year budget framework.

## 7. Student societies

### 7.1 Report from the University of Saskatchewan Students’ Union

USSU President Jared Brown and Academic Vice-president Ruvimbo Kanyemba presented a verbal report on recent activities of the USSU. Highlights of the last month include

- New tenants confirmed for lower Place Riel, including a campus dentist, a hair salon and a phone outlet;
- A new manager, James Haywood, for Louis’ (Jason Kovitch will be joining the administrative team);
- The referendum for a summer U-Pass took place in mid November and passed with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Brown indicated to Council that he did not realize when he began his term that the College of Medicine would be one of the main concerns of his term as USSU president. He reported that he has reached out to the president of the college’s student society and can confirm that the students are in full support of the proposal being brought forward today and supportive of the

prioritization that is being given to teaching. The students are concerned, though, about the transition period and about the quality of their education as they complete their degrees.

The chair then invited questions from members of Council.

A member asked Mr. Brown to comment on a recent study done by the Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms, and asked whether he and his executive would provide Council with a description of the policies and practices of the USSU with respect to encouraging freedom of expression. Mr. Brown pointed out two recent events that took place in the tunnel in which both sides of controversial issues were represented.

The acting dean of the College of Medicine rose to address the concerns of medical students, and indicated that on receipt of the students' letter he had called a meeting of all department heads and associate deans and asked for a renewed commitment to the undergraduate program, including a plan to address the seven points raised by the students to be in place in January to respond quickly and get the issues resolved, as well as a communication strategy. He has asked the department heads to ensure that any learning time lost is made up within the term, and he will be monitoring the plan and will hold to the college's commitment not to allow the restructuring to affect the education of medical students.

The Chair invited members of Council to join him in thanking Mr. Brown and Ms. Kanyemba for a very thorough report.

## 7.2 Report from the Graduate Students' Association

GSA President Ehimai Ohiozebau presented an oral report on the activities of the Graduate Students' Association. The report included the following updates:

- Two surveys have been carried out in the past month, one concerning UPASS and the other on health and dental reform. On the former, negotiations with Saskatoon Transit that began in October resulted in an agreement to gauge interest by conducting a survey; this has been completed and the response was impressive. The next phase will be a referendum in January or February 2013.
- The second survey, on the expansion of health and dental benefits for graduate students, showed graduate students are in favour of prescription drug coverage at no extra cost, with the additional benefits to be financed from the plan's surplus.
- The GSA is supportive of the process the university is undertaking to look at providing additional child care facilities, but is also engaged in a complementary process and will be looking into options; they hope to have recommendations next term.

Mr. Ohiozebau closed by wishing Council members a happy holiday season; Council members joined the chair in thanking him for his report.

## 8. Academic Programs Committee

Professor Roy Dobson, chair of the academic programs committee, presented the reports to Council.

### 8.1 Request for Decision: College of Graduate Studies and Research admission qualifications

Dr. Dobson stressed that this motion is permissive and would not require departments to permit direct entry to their doctoral programs.

DOBSON/ZELLO: That the College of Graduate Studies and Research admission qualifications be revised to permit students to directly enter a Ph.D. program from a bachelor's degree.

CARRIED

8.2 Request for Decision: College of Dentistry admission qualifications

A member asked for more information about the correlation between the results of this test and performance as well whether other dental schools in the country are still using the test as a basis for admission decisions. Dr. Ken Sutherland of the College of Dentistry responded by indicating that the correlation is below 0.2, and that of the dental schools in Canada there are still 4 or 5 that still require the manual dexterity test, and that this number will likely be reduced further by next May.

DOBSON/ZELLO: That the College of Dentistry admission qualifications be revised to delete the carving portion (manual dexterity) of the Dental School Admission (DAT) test as a requirement for application for admission to the dental program, effective the 2014/15 admissions cycle.

CARRIED

8.3 Item for Information: Academic Calendar for 2013/14; double-listing of DENT/MED courses

Dr. Dobson corrected the date of the October Council meeting on the circulated schedule; it should read October 24 rather than October 17. A member commented that setting a Friday break before the Thanksgiving holiday, thereby creating two four-day weeks in a row, has a detrimental effect on first and second year laboratory courses. He asked that this be reviewed before next year's calendar is set. The registrar responded that the draft schedule is sent out to all college associate deans for consultation as well as being discussed at the associate deans' group. He committed to further discussion with that group about how departments could provide input.

9. Planning and Priorities Committee

These reports were presented by planning and priorities committee chair, Dr. Bob Tyler, who began by expressing thanks to the president for her encouraging remarks and to the committee for their hard work this year.

9.1 Request for Decision: Approval of C-EBLIP: Evidence-based Library and Information Practice as a Type A Centre

Dr. Tyler characterized the development of this centre as a step in the evolution of the Library as an academic and research unit.

TYLER/KHANDELWAL: That Council approve the establishment of the Centre for Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (C-EBLIP) as a Type A Centre in the University Library, effective December 20, 2012.

CARRIED

9.2 Request for Decision: Approval of SERI: Sustainability Education Research Institute as a Type A Centre

Dr. Tyler described the mission, governance, scope, budget and funding arrangements for the centre as outlined in the agenda materials, and the consultation process that was undertaken before bringing the proposal forward. He also explained the reason that this has been conceived as a Type A centre, since the funding and primary researcher are provided within one College.

TYLER/WALLEY: That Council approve the establishment of the Sustainability Education Research Institute (SERI) as a Type A Centre in the College of Education, effective December 20, 2012.

CARRIED

The chair then called on Vice-chair John Rigby to chair the meeting for consideration of the next item, declaring a potential conflict of interest because this matter concerns his own college. Dr. Rigby explained how the presentation of this item would unfold, indicating that the mover and seconder and the acting dean would present the item, and that he would then invite debate. He indicated that non-members of Council would be allowed to speak and that all speakers would be limited to three minutes.

9.3 Request for Decision: Approval in Principle of the College of Medicine Vision document

Dr. Tyler explained the reasons for this being brought as approval in principle: there is no structural change being brought to Council and nothing yet that Council needs to formally approve, though there may be specific items that Council will need to approve arising from the subsequent implementation document. He explained the motion reflects the expectation of the planning and priorities committee with respect to timing of the development of a plan. He spoke briefly to each of the criteria used by the committee to assess the vision.

The chair then invited Dr. Lou Qualtiere, acting Dean of the College of Medicine, to present. Dr. Qualtiere described the mandate of the college with reference to a graphic projected on the screen of the theatre. He stressed that the college does not have direct responsibility for delivering clinical service as part of its mandate, though the vast majority of training for post-graduate residents and much of the undergraduate program is done in the presence of clinical work. In the past, everyone –faculty, students, administration, the public—has seen clinical work as part of the mandate; correcting that perception will require a cultural change, particularly given that many faculty were hired specifically to deliver clinical service. Dr. Qualtiere emphasized that the document does not seek to assign blame. He expressed confidence that an implementation plan will be developed by June and presented to the provost at that time. The decision of the accreditors, who will visit in March, will largely be judged on information that has already been submitted to them.

The dean expressed his agreement with the report of the planning and priorities committee. He encouraged Council not only to endorse the vision but to remain engaged and continue to demand accountability from the College.

The chair then invited Provost Brett Fairbairn to formally second the motion. Dr. Fairbairn began by thanking all of those directly affected in the college, and singled out the dean and members of the dean's advisory committee and its working groups for their enormous investments of time and energy. The college faculty council has embraced a call for fundamental change without opposition, and faculty, staff and students have contributed a huge number of ideas, suggestions and

comments. The provost observed how far the college has come since in the past few months: despite the fact that the vision paper presented today doesn't look significantly different from the concept paper presented to Council last May, what has been gained in seven months is a paper authored within the college that indicates the college as a whole is irrevocably committed to fundamental change.

To illustrate his point the provost reminded Council that the notion that accreditation is simply a 'smokescreen' has been put to rest; all are now agreed that accreditation is a tangible and serious issue in and of itself as well as being a symptom of concerns that need to be addressed. He echoed the USSU in observing that students have played a laudable role in appropriately pointing out problems and insisting they be addressed. He pointed out that the vision paper starkly lays out some of the deficiencies in teaching and research and some fundamental ideas about how to address them. These ideas include the expectation that virtually every physician in the province will be needed to deliver on the college's mission, and the expectation that the university's resources must be realigned behind the teaching and research mission while clinical resources will need to be provided by those who have responsibility for clinical outcomes.

Finally, the provost commented on the critical role of Council in bringing this discussion to its current stage and the need for Council's continued attention in monitoring the timely development and implementation of the teaching and research activities arising from this document, and in ensuring that accreditation is achieved and the structural problems resolved. He stressed that the motion before Council commits the college and the provost to reporting back to Council on the progress of key items within specified time lines.

The chair then opened the floor to debate.

A member expressed concerns that Council is being asked to endorse a vision that will help the college become accredited when the accreditors are visiting in March and when the vision document itself does not specify what the new governance structures will be or how the goals will be achieved within existing resources, and does not meet all of the criteria laid out by the president earlier this year. The chair of the planning and priorities committee responded by agreeing that this document and the resulting plan—which will require the involvement and cooperation of the government and the health region—come too late to affect the accrediting visit in March, though it may provide some confidence to the accreditation team and will provide a trajectory for resolving the complex issues faced by the college. He reminded Council that what is being requested is 'approval in principle' because no specific action is yet being proposed or committed to. The provost asked the member whether her concern would be satisfied if Council were to be briefed about what the accreditors observe in March; she agreed this would be helpful. Vice-provost Phillipson clarified that the accreditors' visit is about a notice of probation but the college is not currently on probation but is accredited. In the long term, the plan must make it possible for the college to break the pattern of moving from accreditation crisis to accreditation crisis.

A member spoke in favour of the motion and particularly in favour of the document's emphasis on research. While he would have liked to see more detail, he appreciates that this framework is necessary for the long-term project of changing the research culture and developing appropriate research networks.

Another member indicated that he had voted against the concept paper in May because of a lack of evidence that the faculty of the college supported it. He asked what evidence there is that the faculty are supportive of the vision paper. Dr. Hoepfner, head of the Department of Medicine, spoke as a member of the working group and assured Council that the vision paper has broad support from faculty, department heads and students.

Dr. Danilkewich, Department head in Family Medicine, spoke in favour of the motion but cautioned that a balanced approach is needed to ensure that the emphasis on undergraduate students does not disadvantage the large number of postgraduate residents.

There being no further questions or comments, Dr. Rigby called for the motion.

TYLER/FAIRBAIRN: It is recommended that Council approve:

- (i) in principle, the document entitled *A New Vision for the College of Medicine*
- (ii) that commencing in April, 2013, the Provost and the Dean/Acting Dean of Medicine report regularly to University Council on progress made toward development of an implementation plan for the vision described in *A New Vision for the College of Medicine*, and on the accreditation status of the undergraduate medical education (M.D.) program in the College of Medicine; and
- (iii) that an implementation plan for the vision document that addresses the criteria established by the Planning and Priorities Committee for assessment of any renewal plan, as reported to Council on November 15, 2012, be submitted to the Planning and Priorities Committee by August 15, 2013.

CARRIED

Dr. Rigby commented on the importance of the unanimous decision just taken, observing that a common starting point bodes well for a positive outcome.

Dr. Kalra then returned to the chair.

#### 10. Governance Committee

Dr. Gordon Zello presented these reports as chair of the governance committee.

##### 10.1 Notice of Motion: Proposed faculty council membership for the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy

Dr. Zello provided notice that the following motion will be put forward at the January meeting of Council:

*“ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the proposed membership of the faculty council for the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy.”*

The chair invited any member of Council who has questions or comments on the proposed membership to be in touch with the governance committee or the secretary.

##### 10.2 Item for Information: Guidelines for University Council Motions, Minutes, Committee Meetings and Minutes

Dr. Zello noted that this item, which is presented for information, arose from a request at a Council meeting earlier this year for more information about the procedures followed by Council and its committees.

#### 11. Other business



A member of Council spoke on behalf of the host committee for the Executive of the American Indigenous Studies Association to give advance notice of the conference of the Association, which will take place on our campus June 13-15. To date the committee has received more than 750 abstracts for the conference and hopes to have 1000 delegates in attendance.

A member invited Council to express thanks to Dr. Dan Pennock for his excellent work as acting Vice-provost for teaching and learning over the past year.

A member asked for clarification of the purpose of a campus safety advisory that was recently sent to the entire campus community concerning an individual distributing material that, according to the advisory, some individuals might find offensive. He expressed concern about the ambiguity of the message and its release under the aegis of campus safety. Associate vice-president (communications) Ivan Muzychka conceded that this advisory should not have been identified as a safety issue but rather as a campus communications matter. The president then spoke to the matter, assuring members that the university will not permit the work environment to be poisoned by actions that people experience as harassing or offensive. She also stressed that the university is a place of civil debate on important issues. Members of the community should be permitted to express themselves even if their point of view is controversial or not politically correct, provided that they do not cross a line that results in an environment where individuals are fearful about coming on campus to work or study. She explained that the material referenced in the advisory crossed that line, and there were employees on the campus that drew it to the administration's attention.

#### 12. Question period

A member referenced a recently-announced on-line master's degree in health administration being offered by the University of Regina through the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, and asked the provost whether there are any plans for the University of Saskatchewan to participate in offering the degree. The provost reminded Council that the School of Public Policy is unique in offering programs from two institutions, each of which grants its own degrees. Some of these programs result in a credential that is approved by both institutions, but each institution is also free to approve its own programs. The provost committed to investigating whether there is any intention for the U of S to begin offering this degree.

#### 13. Adjournment

The chair brought the meeting to a close by commenting that there had been an end-of-term social for Council members at the University Club the previous afternoon, at which the university secretary presented the results of her research project on academic senates in Canada. He expressed heartfelt thanks to all those who have worked hard over the past few months in the academic oversight of the institution, and announced that the December edition of Council's newsletter to the General Academic Assembly (GAA) would be going out by the end of the year. On behalf of Council and its committees and the secretariat Dr. Kalra wished all those in attendance an enjoyable holiday season.

DesBRISAY/DAUM SHANKS: That the meeting be adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

CARRIED

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, Thursday, January 24, 2013. If you are unable to attend this meeting please send regrets to: Lesley.Leonhardt@usask.ca