

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained. A tribute to Prof. Robert Kerrich, McLeod Chair in Geological Sciences was presented by Prof. Jim Merriam, Head of the department of Geological Sciences. A moment of silence was observed.

1. Adoption of the agenda

SINGH/URQUHART: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED (ONE OPPOSED)

2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra welcomed members and visitors, and noted the matters to be addressed during the meeting.

3. Minutes of the meeting of May 16, 2013

URQUHART/SINGH: That the Council minutes of May 16, 2013 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 commended Council chair, Jay Kalra, for being one of the top 25 to receive the Royal Bank of Canada Immigrant Canadian award. The president noted that there were 600 candidates, 30,000 votes and Dr. Kalra was one of a number of wonderful candidates chosen. The president noted Dr. Kalra's accomplishments and achievements.

The president noted that the second part of the Aboriginal symposium on Saskatchewan education was held on June 12th and thanked everyone involved in its planning including Pauline Melis, Patti MacDougall and Heather Magotiaux. She announced that the university hosted the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association's annual conference on June 13 – 15 which was a wonderful event. This was the first time the conference was hosted in Canada and was the largest gathering of indigenous scholars in history, with approximately 850 delegates. She thanked everyone involved including Rob Innis, Signa Daum-Shanks, Candice Wasacase-Lafferty and Joan Greyeyes.

The president recognized that June 21 is National Aboriginal Day and that the official ground breaking for the Gordon Oakes-Red Bear Student Centre will occur this day, marking the beginning of the building of this centre after more than two years of planning.

The president recognized that this meeting marked her attendance at a year of University Council meetings. She provided comments on transitions that had occurred over the past year including: moving from controversial discussions about the College of Medicine to having a plan drafted by the college and close to a unanimous vote to move forward with a new vision for the college both by the

college faculty and University Council. Another transition involving Council has been TransformUS where there are two good task forces looking at prioritization of services and academic programs. The president noted that this shows modeling of financial sustainability and thanked the provost, vice-president finance and resources, Institutional Planning and Assessment and others working on this initiative.

The president acknowledged that it is time for her to work with the university community to create a new vision for the university. Her intent is to create a green paper that will engage the community and, which she intends to submit to Council in October to allow members to provide comments before the final version is generated. The president acknowledged that her aim is not to produce something that everyone finds non-offensive, but rather to state clearly the direction that the university will go.

The president announced the following six principles as those developed by the Graduate Education Review Committee:

1. We want to aim to lead in graduate education rather than simply catch up to our peers.
2. We need to aim for flexibility for each unit to achieve their goals and outcomes.
3. There needs to be a changed mandate for a centralized graduate administration unit – from “enforcer of policies” to “active program engagement and facilitation.”
4. Decisions need to promote innovation while retaining simplicity and coherence.
5. There is a need to be data-driven and responsive to the needs of students – focusing on the external needs of the users rather than the internal needs of the providers.
6. There is a need to be clear about what functions are better served by maintaining centrally, (i.e.: admissions, funding, quality assurance) and what functions can be more easily done at the college/unit level.

The president advised that discussions will be held with Council, the Graduate Students’ Association (GSA), Acting Dean and staff at the College of Graduate Studies and Research.

6. Report of the Provost

Brett Fairbairn, provost and vice-president academic, noted that his written report was contained in the meeting materials and that there were two areas to which he wanted to add additional comments. First, he noted the second part of the Aboriginal symposium was held which was one of the commitments in the third integrated plan. The provost noted that based on what he had heard at the symposium, there were four points that will guide the university:

1. An important concept is that the university proceeds on the basis of trust and partnerships.
2. When thinking about Aboriginal engagement and relationships, it should not be business as usual, but transformational change.
3. Indigenous engagement is part of everyone’s core business at the university.
4. Key elements are setting and measuring targets and being accountable for our progress.

Secondly, the provost reported that the financial town hall was held June 13th. In terms of the university’s permanent budget targets, in order to be sustainable by 2016, the actions taken in the past year to April 30th will have an ongoing permanent effect on our budget in excess of \$15M per year, largely due to the workforce planning. The provost reported that as of the end of the 2012-13 year, the university has concluded the year with a small surplus (0.5%) due largely to a positive outcome of our investments, but noted that the largest part of the gains are one-time measures.

The provost reported on highlights of the ongoing financial sustainability of the university. After the first year, it has become clear that this process is about finding new ways of doing things and the university moving to a priority-based budgeting process, rather than an additive budgeting process.

7. Student societies

7.1 Report from the USSU

Max FineDay, president of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union, reported on what he and the USSU vice-presidents were working on. He also noted that the USSU may from time to time use the opportunity to speak at Council on what students think is important and move beyond reporting to Council on the USSU's activities. Mr. FineDay advised that if any council members had questions on what students are thinking with respect to issues being discussed at Council, that the USSU would be happy to answer them.

7.2 Report from the GSA

Ehimai Ohiozebau, president of the Graduate Students' Association, reported on the GSA's activities including their retreat and the plan for the year. He reported that the GSA was able to give 36 travel grants to students totaling approximately \$10,000. Mr. Ohiozebau advised there will be a curiosity week in March consisting of a two-day conference on March 6-7, a social night, and the GSA awards gala on March 8. He encouraged continued support of the awards gala through financial assistance as well as support to students in presenting at the conference.

Council was advised the GSA supports the university in being a leading university in the area of research. The GSA also supports transforming the College of Graduate Studies and Research and would like to be involved in this process.

8. Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee

Stephen Urquhart, chair of the research, scholarly and artistic work committee, presented the reports to Council.

8.1 Request for decision: Human Research Ethics Policy

URQUHART/SINGH: That Council approve the Human Research Ethics Policy to replace the Policy on Research Involving Human Subjects, effective July 1, 2013.

CARRIED

8.2 Request for decision: Responsible Conduct of Research Policy

Dr. Urquhart advised that the Responsible Conduct of Research policy replaces the Research Integrity policy that was previously approved in 2010. At the May Council meeting, separate points were raised by the GSA and since then meetings have been held with GSA members resulting in substantive changes which are discussed in the written materials. Dr. Urquhart explained that the Tri-Agency requires universities receiving their funding to write a policy within the Tri-Agency's framework recognizing fairness for all parties including students, faculty and staff. Dr. Urquhart advised that the proposed Responsible Conduct of Research policy as revised brings the university fully within the requirements of the Tri-Agency framework.

The following motion was moved and seconded:

URQUHART /SINGH: That Council approve the Responsible Conduct of Research Policy to replace the Research Integrity Policy, effective July 1, 2013.

The motion was discussed. A graduate student noted that he felt there were still some problems with the Responsible Conduct of Research policy in the areas of merits requiring a high threshold of complaints for the inquiry into allegations, which he believed to be different from the Tri-Agency requirement. Secondly, regarding procedures for formal hearings, he thought the student on the hearing board should not be from the same college and therefore not exclude the possibility of bringing in a student from another college which he thought was more in compliance with the Tri-Agency requirements. He expressed additional concerns related to having a sign-on and sign-off procedure when a party is participating by telephone, including a better description of the type of decision coming from an interim report, and broadening the description of the backgrounds for participants on the hearing board.

Dr. Urquhart advised that there is a policy and a procedure and if there are difficulties that administration runs into, then the procedures are updated and the research, scholarly and artistic work committee is informed of the updates. He advised that it is not Council's job to manage the procedure but rather to set the general policy and look to see that the procedures are in alignment with the policy. Regarding the issues of student fairness and having student representatives from other colleges, if a student is found to have breached the Responsible Conduct of Research policy, any sanction is determined under the regulations approved by Council for student academic misconduct.

Diane Martz, director of Research Ethics, advised that regarding the policy being in compliance with the Tri-Agency framework, there is a requirement for it to be in the same spirit, although it does not have to have the same language. Regarding the inquiry into the allegations, based on her discussion with the university's legal advisor and the Tri-agency Secretariat the conclusion was that the criteria in the first stage, the inquiry stage, is exactly the same as what the Tri-Agency requires. Dr. Martz explained to Council that there is a requirement to report to the Tri-Agency if there is an allegation that is serious regarding the safety of people or animals. If the university's report does not meet the satisfaction of the Tri-Agency, the agency will ask for more information.

The student asked that these points be clarified in the policy. Another graduate student noted that she believed that the point regarding the merits is a substantive law requirement as it is a substantive threshold rather than the lower threshold under the Tri-Agency framework. Also, she felt that there is an imbalance of power between the faculty and staff on one hand and the students on the other and questioned whether the policy was treating all parties equally according to the Tri-Agency's requirements, also taking into consideration that students do not have the security of tenure or funding. The student advised that she would also like to see the addition of the following points: timelines of the whole process; a list of recourses or remedies to provide guidance to students; and on appeal, the student member of the appeal board should not be from the same college as the respondent. The student recommended reviewing the requirement of the chair of the original hearing board appearing to answer questions of the appeal board, as this might bias the procedure against the student.

Dr. Urquhart advised that the research, scholarly and artistic work committee had brought this policy forward because they had received advice that the language was appropriate and that the procedures were in alignment with the policy. As an important part of the transparent process, the policy now allows an external member of the university to be involved in the process.

The president of the GSA noted that the GSA had expressed its fundamental concerns to the right people in the process and believed that some of the complaints had been addressed. The policy has been discussed extensively at the GSA. He viewed the current processes as challenging and encouraged the creation of an ombudsperson for the institution.

A Council member questioned one of the grounds of appeal being ‘reasonable apprehension of bias’ noting that other language uses ‘conflict of interest’ and recommended that the term, ‘conflict of interest’ be used as it is more publicly demonstrable and easier to prove.

Karen Chad, vice-president research, explained that in terms of consultation with the legal team and secretariat of the Tri-agency at the national level, the view was that a ‘reasonable apprehension of bias’ was more inclusive than ‘conflict of interest’, and therefore the new policy is consistent with a more comprehensive version. Dr. Chad also noted that it is important to have input into the university’s processes and policies and there has been a lengthy and rich conversation with many constituents in the development of the policy. She advised that the addition of an ombudsperson or like mechanism is being discussed, and she thanked everyone for their input and work.

The chair of the governance committee noted that Council’s regulations for student academic misconduct include a list of possible sanctions and suggested that a link to the regulations be included in the procedures for the policy.

A Council member noted that the idea of ‘reasonable apprehension of bias’ has been seen as a more inclusive approach. Another Council member advised that she agreed that a ‘reasonable apprehension of bias’ is more commonly used and also would benefit the complainant and protects people to a greater extent than ‘conflict of interest’.

A Council member asked whether there would be a problem considering these points and delaying the decision. Dr. Urquhart advised that although the issue of an ombudsperson is important, it is beyond Council’s responsibility. There have been a number of questions specifically about procedures, and Council’s concern should be that the procedures are consistent with the policy but realize that they are subject to change with such updates being reported to Council. Therefore, he advised that he was comfortable with the current drafting of the policy and how it is presented.

A graduate student referred to his original comments and advised that some of their concerns had been addressed and alleviated but he still thought there was a substantive legal difference between determining on the merits of the procedure and what the Tri-Agency requires. Dr. Martz noted that the university holds a different opinion from legal counsel.

The motion was put to a vote.

CARRIED (TWO OPPOSED)

8.3 Request for information: University Research Ethics Boards Annual Reports

Dr. Urquhart explained that the Tri-Agency requires that the university’s research ethics boards’ annual reports be formally received by Council as the highest body with authority over academic matters and that the report has been provided in the written meeting materials. He noted that the research, scholarly and artistic work committee had discussed the report with Dr. Martz, the director of research ethics. There were no questions regarding the report.

8.4 Request for information: Annual Report

Dr. Urquhart advised that the research, scholarly and artistic work committee’s annual report was included in the written meeting materials and that it also included reports from the vice-president research and the dean of the College of Graduate Studies and Research. There were no questions or comments. Dr. Urquhart thanked his committee members and Sandra Calver for her professional and knowledgeable support to the committee.

9. Governance Committee

Dr. Gordon Zello, chair of the governance committee, presented these items to Council.

9.1 Request for decision: Change to Part Two, Section I, VII of Council Bylaws – Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee terms of reference

Dr. Zello advised that the amendment was brought to Council as a notice of motion at the last Council meeting and no questions were received. Dr. Zello noted that a further revision to the terms of reference is to split section seven into two sections for clarification.

ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the proposed changed to Part Two, Section I, VII of Council Bylaws, the terms of reference of the research, scholarly and artistic work committee, with further revisions, effective June 20, 2013.

CARRIED

9.2 Request for decision: Change to Part Two, Section I, I of Council Bylaws – Academic Programs Committee terms of reference

ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the proposed changes to Part Two, Section I, I of the Council Bylaws, the membership and terms of reference for the academic programs committee, effective June 20, 2013.

CARRIED

9.3 Request for decision: Revisions to the College of Education Faculty Council membership

ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the revisions to the College of Education Faculty Council membership.

CARRIED

9.4 Request for decision: Regulations on Student Academic Misconduct

Dr. Zello advised that in light of changes to the Responsible Conduct in Research policy that had just been passed and that in light of the *University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995* whereby Council is responsible for disciplining student misconduct, the governance committee was charged to ensure that the regulations on student academic misconduct were aligned with the Responsible Conduct of Research policy and at the same time took the opportunity to update titles and make other housekeeping changes. Dr. Zello noted that legal advice was received.

The motion was made and seconded followed by discussion. There was a question regarding the potential confusion that might result by including the executive directors of schools with deans in the regulations if the schools only deal with graduate students and that the executive directors need not be included as the dean of Graduate Studies and Research would speak to the issue. The provost and vice-president academic advised that regarding the status of the three interdisciplinary graduate schools, Council has clearly stated that these schools are equivalent to colleges and that the executive directors are equivalent to deans so there is no restriction to the schools providing only graduate programs. He further stated that although it was understood that the schools would begin with graduate studies, there has been considerable discussion about undergraduate programs at one of the schools and therefore he thought it wise to include the “executive director” language in these procedures.

Dr. Zello advised that although there may be a question whether issues would go to the dean of Graduate Studies and Research or the dean of the college where a graduate student attends, he believed that the procedure was being revised correctly.

ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the revisions to the 'Regulations on Student Academic Misconduct' effective July 1, 2013.

CARRIED (ONE OPPOSED)

9.5 Request for decision: Nominations to the Nominations Committee for 2013/14

The chair called three times for nominations from the floor and there were none.

ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the following nominations to the Nominations Committee, effective July 1, 2013:

Appointments expiring June 30 as indicated:

2014-Ed Krol, Pharmacy and Nutrition, re-appointed
2014-Michael McGregor, Psychology, Arts and Science
2014-Michele Prytula, Educational Administration, Education
2015-Signa Daum Shanks, Law
2015-Yen-Han Lin, Chemical and Biological Engineering, Engineering
2015-Curtis Pozniak, Plant Sciences, Agriculture and Bioresources
2016-Dwayne Brenna, Drama, Arts and Science, re-appointed
2016-Terry Wotherspoon, Sociology, Arts and Science, re-appointed
2016-Susan Fowler-Kerry, Nursing

One year appointment as Chair, expiring June 30:

2014-Ed Krol, Pharmacy and Nutrition

CARRIED

9.6 Request for decision: College of Engineering request for approval to delegate responsibilities to its committees

Dr. Zello advised that faculty councils are required to seek approval from University Council if the faculty council wishes to further delegate duties that have been delegated to the faculty council by University Council.

ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the request of the College of Engineering faculty council to delegate responsibilities to its committees.

CARRIED

9.7 Notice of motion: College of Agriculture and Bioresources Faculty Council membership

ZELLO/DOBSON: That Council approve the revisions to the College of Agriculture and Bioresources Faculty Council membership.

CARRIED

Dr. Zello thanked the governance committee members and the support from the University Secretary, especially Lesley Leonhardt, Lea Pennock and Sandra Calver over the past three years.

9.8 Report for information: Student Appeals Report for 2012-13

The university secretary noted that there were eight applications for appeals in academic matters submitted between May 1, 2012 and April 30, 2013. Of the eight applications, seven went to a hearing board. There was one application for an appeal of a decision of a college hearing board under Council's Academic Misconduct Regulations. The university secretary determined there were grounds for appeal and the appeal board overturned the college of graduate studies and research's decision to expel a student.

10. Nominations Committee

Dr. Ed Krol, vice-chair of the nominations committee, presented this report to Council.

10.1 Request for decision: Additional nominations for 2013-14

Dr. Krol advised that the nominations address those positions vacated recently or other appointments that were required.

The chair called three times for nominations from the floor and there were none.

KROL /DOBSON: That Council approve the following nomination to the Senate Roundtable on Outreach and Engagement, to a three-year term ending June 30, 2016:
Glenn Hussey Physics and Engineering Physics (reappointment);

And that Council approve the following nominations to the Renewals and Tenure Appeal Panel:

To June 30, 2016

Kevin Ansdell	Geological Sciences
Ron Cooley	English
Jill Hobbs	Bioresource Policy, Business and Economics
David Mykota	Educational Psychology and Special Education

To June 30, 2015

Cindy Peternelj-Taylor	Nursing
------------------------	---------

To June 30, 2014

Angela Busch	Physical Therapy
--------------	------------------

CARRIED

11. Academic Programs Committee

Dr. Roy Dobson, chair of the academic programs committee, presented these items to Council.

11.1 Request for decision: Replacement program for Post-Degree Bachelor of Science in Nursing

DOBSON /ZELLO: That Council approve the proposal from the College of Nursing for a replacement program in the Post-Degree Bachelor of Science in Nursing (PDBSN).

CARRIED

11.2 Request for decision: College of Arts and Science – Certificate in Criminology and Addictions

Dr Dobson noted that as was described in the written materials, the academic programs committee has asked that the prerequisites for the internship courses be strengthened, that a

commitment be added to review the programs' success, and that the college not move too quickly to terminate the minor presently available in the criminology area, pending further evaluation of student demand in this program area.

DOBSON /ZELLO: That Council approve the proposal from the College of Arts and Science to create a Certificate in Criminology and Addictions.

CARRIED

11.3 Request for decision: College of Arts and Science – Termination of the BA Four-year and Honours in Community Planning and Native Studies

Dr. Dobson advised that due to low demand for this program, the college is developing a certificate program as a replacement.

DOBSON /ZELLO: That Council approve the termination of the BA Four-year and Honours in Community Planning and Native Studies.

CARRIED

11.4 Report for information: Annual Report

Dr. Dobson noted the annual report contained in the materials. There were no questions or comments. Dr. Dobson thanked the members of the committee for their hard work and dedicated service and Cathie Fornssler for her secretarial support of the committee.

12. Planning and Priorities Committee

Bob Tyler, chair of the planning and priorities committee presented these reports to Council.

12.1 Request for decision: Disestablishment of Open Studies

Dr. Tyler advised that two motions are required to disestablish Open Studies and to amend the bylaws. The change to the bylaws is consequential to the motion to disestablish so does not require 30 days' notice of motion to which the governance committee concurs.

TYLER /DOBSON: That Council approve that the existing model for Open Studies be discontinued, effective January 1, 2014.

CARRIED

TYLER/DOBSON: That the Open Studies Faculty Council be dissolved as of May 1, 2014, with Council's Bylaws amended to reflect the dissolution.

CARRIED

12.2 Report for information: Progress Report on Promise and Potential: the Third Integrated Plan

Dr. Tyler advised that in light of the current reality, the approach to the third integrated plan (IP3) has been less process intensive than the implementation of the second integrated plan. He noted that the report in the written meeting materials indicates that although there are some process intensive longer term aspects, overall the focus has been on shorter projects. Dr. Tyler recommended Council to the website developed on IP3 implementation. There were no questions or comments.

12.3 Report for information: Annual Report

Dr. Tyler noted the report of the committee contained in the written meeting materials. There were no questions or comments. Dr. Tyler thanked his committee members and resource personnel providing a special thanks to Sandra Calver for her secretarial support and to Lois Jaeck who has served as vice-chair to this committee. He commended Fran Walley who will be the new chair of the committee and thanked all of those on Council for their contributions.

13. Academic Support Committee

13.1 Report for information: Annual Report

Ralph Deter, chair of the committee noted that the committee's report was contained in the written meeting materials. There were no questions or comments. Dr. Deter thanked his colleagues and committee members and Cathie Fornssler for her secretarial support.

14. Teaching and Learning Committee

14.1 Report for information: Annual Report

The annual report was contained in the written meeting materials however no one presented on this report and there were no questions or comments.

15. International Activities Committee

15.1 Report for information: Annual Report

Hans Michelmann, chair of the committee noted the report contained in the written meeting material. There were no comments or questions. Dr. Michelmann thanked his committee members for their enthusiasm for the internationalization of the university and also thanked Cathie Fornssler for her professionalism and secretarial support of the committee.

16. Joint Committee on Chairs and Professorships

16.1 Report for information: Annual Report

It was noted that Jim Germida, vice-provost faculty relations and chair of the joint committee on chairs and professorships was not available but that Jim Basinger would answer any questions regarding the report contained in the written meeting materials. There were no questions or comments.

17. Scholarships and Awards Committee

17.1 Report for information: Annual Report

Dr. Gordon DesBrisay, chair of the committee, noted the report in the written meeting materials. There were no questions or comments. Dr. DesBrisay thanked the committee members and committee secretary, Wendy Klingenberg, for her good service and support of the committee. As designated dean of Open Studies, he also thanked the Open Studies faculty council, Sandra Ritchie, Lucille Otero, Sandra Calver, Bob Tyler and Roy Dobson as well as the planning and priorities committee and academic programs committee for their work leading to the disestablishment of Open Studies.

18. Chair's Closing Remarks

The chair thanked the chairs of the committees and recognized John Kleefeld, Hans Michelmann, Bev Pain, Bob Tyler, Stephen Urquhart, and Gordon Zello as retiring chairs. He also thanked Pauline Melis, assistant provost, institutional planning and assessment and her staff; Ivan Muzychka, associate vice-president, communications and his staff; and Elizabeth Williamson, university secretary and her staff.

19. Other business

A Council member noted that the employees whose employment had been discontinued had little opportunity to transfer their files to others. She also wondered if these individuals will be interested in giving bequests and encouraging their children to come to the university in the future; and questioned whether it was necessary that the majority of these people lost their jobs. A Council member noted that the practice of escorting employees off campus without allowing their colleagues to provide a farewell showed a lack of decorum and consideration of their feelings.

Greg Fowler, vice-president finance and resources, explained that the process being used is based on the best interest of the individual. The university has trained counselors who work with these individuals, and the individuals have an opportunity to return to campus with university staff and also an opportunity to have a farewell party. However, he confirmed that they cannot return to the workforce the day they are terminated because it is too upsetting for them and others in their unit.

The Council member suggested that if the individuals being let go were given three weeks' notice, the process could be much better and that the university was not on the right path.

Mr. Fowler replied that the process being followed is what the university has determined to be the best process at this time, although other options are being reviewed. Personally he had experienced both and providing notice resulted in a very negative experience. He had received positive feedback about the process and noted that there is a continuum of reactions. Although the individual's position has been eliminated, the university tries to show respect for the person as much as possible and follow up with them.

20. Question period

A Council member commented that he thought the agenda was too dense and that a lengthy agenda is a powerful damper on debate and that as a result a number of the items could not be dealt with properly. He felt this did not leave Council in a good position to monitor its business appropriately. The chair thanked the Council member for his comment and advised that there was encouragement for annual reports to be provided in May to lighten the June agenda.

21. Adjournment

URQUHART/SINGH: That the meeting be adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

CARRIED

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, September 19, 2013