

*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.

#### Tribute

Dr. Dennis Gorecki, Professor Emeritus and former Dean of the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition, provided a memorial tribute to Professor Beverly Edward Allen, Assistant Professor of the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition who passed away March 15, 2013 after a lengthy battle with cancer. A moment of silence was recognized.

#### 1. Adoption of the agenda

BONHAM-SMITH/RODGERS: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

#### 2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra welcomed members, students, other guests and Elizabeth Williamson, the new University Secretary. Council welcomed Ms. Williamson with applause.

Dr. Kalra reminded those present of the usual seating arrangements, media representatives were asked not to participate in any debate or motions, and it was noted that the co-chairs of the two TransformUS task forces and the president would be available for comments following the meeting. The conduct of Council meetings was outlined, with Dr. Kalra noting that Council members have first priority to speak. All attendees were asked to provide their names and whether they were members of Council, prior to speaking.

Ms. Williamson advised Council that Dr. Jay Kalra had been elected by acclamation to the role of chair of Council for a two-year term. She noted that this is the beginning of Dr. Kalra's second term. She thanked Dr. Kalra for operating Council both efficiently and effectively and looked forward to the same over the next two years. Council joined Ms. Williamson in applauding Dr. Kalra.

#### 3. Minutes of the meeting of March 21, 2013

D'EON/DALAI: That the Council minutes of March 21, 2013 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

#### 4. Business from the minutes

No business was identified as arising from the minutes.

#### 5. Report of the Provost

The chair advised that he had received regrets from Dr. Brett Fairbairn, Provost and Vice-President, Academic, but that his report was included in the materials and that Vice-Provost, Faculty Relations,

Dr. Jim Germida was at the meeting and would answer any questions. There were no questions or comments.

## 6. Student societies

### 6.1 Report from the USSU

Mr. Jared Brown, President of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union (USSU), presented a verbal report. He noted that he was unable to attend the last Council meeting because he had gone to Regina for budget day, and chose not to return due to inclement weather.

Mr. Brown provided an overview of what the USSU has done over the course of the year, including:

- Implemented internal evaluations for the student executive members twice a year, rather than once at the end of their term as done previously, to allow the executive to learn and improve their performance.
- Participated in a Summer UPass referendum which students will be able to utilize going forward
- Executive members attended conferences in Montreal and Vancouver;
- Began conversations internally to entertain moving to a pass/fail system in non-professional colleges
- Passed motions at the USSU annual general meeting to affirm the USSU's autonomy as a separate organization from the university.
- Members of student councils have taken on additional responsibilities, including being members of this body and having a larger relationship within their student societies.

Alexandria Werenka, USSU Vice-President Student Affairs informed Council of a number of events hosted by the USSU in 2013, some of which included: Let's Do Vocal; various events focused on a communal atmosphere for students;; the display of student art work in Place Riel; Aboriginal Achievement Week; lobbied to have students on the Transform US task forces; and implemented a student undergraduate symposium, showcasing undergraduate student research in the Place Riel Tunnel. She noted that the Gordon Oakes Red Bear Student Centre has had positive progression to date.

Mr. Brown noted that he was graduating this year. He commended the team effort of the USSU and expressed that he thought it had been a successful year. Looking into the future, he indicated he was thrilled with the four executive members who are incoming. In closing, he introduced Jenna Moellenbeck, Vice-President Operations and Finance and Max FineDay, USSU President Elect.

The chair thanked the leadership of the USSU and Council applauded their performance.

### 6.2 Report from the GSA

Mr. Ehimai Ohiozebau, president of the Graduate Students' Association, presented the report to Council. He commended Dr. Kalra for his role as Council Chair, and thanked the USSU for a good working relationship and collegiality, especially with Jared Brown.

Mr. Ohiozebau provided the GSA's mission statement:

- Ensure graduate students have access to quality services that support their academic success
- Advocate for the unique needs and concerns of graduate students on and off campus
- Build a cohesive graduate student community

He illustrated the GSA's governance structure and noted that he was both pleased and blessed to be president of this association. He informed Council that the GSA executive held a retreat in May 2012 to determine the 2012/13 focus of the association. The GSA determined that its focus would be on: services, campaigns, events, student representation, and Aboriginal liaison.

The focus on campaigns included: review of graduate students' funding; review of university residence policies and procedures, and inclusion of graduates with advanced degrees in the Saskatchewan Graduate Retention Program. Mr. Ohiozebau noted that the GSA has had a good working relationship with university administration and most of these campaigns have been well-received.

Mr. Ohiozebau commented on the GSA's involvement in academic/research integrity issues, noting that there were 18 complaints and it took approximately 20 hours per month to represent each student on these issues. He also noted the GSA's representation on Council and Senate committees, as well as several search committees. Mr. Ohiozebau advised that the GSA Council was reorganized, and he noted the external events attended by members of the GSA.

Regarding services and events, Mr. Ohiozebau listed those that had improved over the past year including: workshops and seminars; an increase in bursaries from \$20,000 to \$40,000; orientation; health and dental plans; GSA Commons; and the GSA handbook. The services and events begun this year included; a Halloween Party; referendum and negotiations with Saskatoon Transit for an annual U-Pass for 2013/14; Childcare Co-op; and the first annual GSA Awards Gala.

The involvement of GSA members in their general elections and orientation was illustrated, showing a significant improvement in both. Mr. Ohiozebau advised that the GSA executive plan to have a retreat again in May, and will report back to Council on their focus for 2013/14. He thanked the people he worked with, the president for her support, members of senior management, deans of colleges, and the chair of council. He also thanked Dr. Paul Jones, his advisor, for sharing him with the university community.

The chair thanked Mr. Ohiozebau, and congratulated him on his election as GSA president for 2013/14. Council applauded Mr. Ohiozebau.

## 7. Report of the President

President Busch-Vishniac noted that it has been a pleasure to work both with the USSU and GSA this year and commented that her faith in our future is restored when working with both of these bodies.

The president introduced Victoria Cowan, 3<sup>rd</sup> year English Honours Student to Council advising that Ms. Cowan was the first Saskatchewan student to receive a 3M National Student Fellowship. This is the second year they are given out, with only 10 given each year. They are awarded to honours students who have demonstrated qualities of leadership. The president listed the voluntary organizations with which Ms. Cowan has had extensive involvement, noting that she has been a leader on and off campus through her volunteerism as a peer mentor with the University Learning Centre, as a teacher-intern with Inspired Minds, and as a volunteer with the Otesha Project, an environmental sustainability and youth empowerment organization. Council was informed that Ms. Cowan had also received the USSU's Vera Pezer Award for student enhancement. The president congratulated Ms. Cowan, noting that further greatness was expected from her.

The president provided comments on TransformUS, advising that it is a presidential initiative to review all of the university's academic programs and services to make sure our resources match our priorities and goals. She addressed the number of rumours that have spread regarding administration

having preconceived ideas of what programs or services might be eliminated and denied that there was any truth in these rumours. She noted that the task forces will make decisions based on criteria and weightings and advised members to dismiss any such rumours.

The president also reported that she had heard the concern that a lot of work will occur over the summer. She noted that TransformUS will take place over the full year, and everyone was invited to make comments. Council was advised that the task forces could not take time off during the summer as this is the time when many of our employees have more time to provide their comments. Council was reminded that even after the task force reports are released, the normal governance procedures will be followed regarding any recommendations to reduce programs.

The president provided an apology to members of Council, advising that in her letter of January 11, 2013 to the university community she stated that once the criteria was tentatively developed by the task forces it would be shared to the university community for comment and also go to Council for endorsement. Upon reflection, she expressed that she realized this approach was problematic. The two most important reasons being: thoughts and comments have been invited from the entire community and to ask Council for endorsement would suggest that the thoughts of others are less valued; and more importantly, if Council endorses the criteria then what ends up in the fifth quintile of programs to be phased out could present a problem as Council looks at each program individually. The president advised that she did not want Council to tie its own hands and wanted Council to follow its normal processes, therefore she was not asking for endorsement of the criteria from Council.

#### 8. TransformUS: Update and request for feedback

The chair introduced the co-chairs of the TransformUS task forces, Beth Bilson and Lisa Kalynchuk for the academic program transformation task force (APT task force) and Kevin Schneider and Bob Tyler for the support service transformation task force (SST task force).

Dr. Tyler provided a summary of the work conducted by the SST task force to date. He advised that each task force attended workshops in March assisted by Mr. Larry Goldstein to initiate the process. Both task forces have met several times since and plan to continue to meet over the summer. Both task forces are at the stage of developing templates of the self-study documents that will go out. This will be the primary tool used to obtain information although other sources will also be used. The proposed criteria and weightings were developed at the initial workshop and have been circulated to the university community seeking comments by noon on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. The task forces will review the comments received and finalize the criteria and weightings.

Dr. Tyler advised that the SST task force is working on a draft template and plans to complete the preliminary version in May. It will then try a sample template on three programs/functional areas and adjust as necessary after that. The task force hopes to have a final template ready early in June to be circulated for completion. The SST task force would like to have the completed templates back by early August.

Dr. Tyler noted that the task force has met a number of times. This has resulted in more work for the co-chairs than expected. The co-chairs have attended meetings with the Deans' Council, a town hall for students and University Council. There have been a few problems with the TransformUS website which have now been fixed. The SST task force has identified approximately 200 functional services. The task force needs to determine what information it needs to then identify its data requirements.

Dr. Bilson noted that the APT task force has been following a similar process as the SST task force. The APT task force is still working on the list of programs to be reviewed. There has been a challenge in identifying the programs because although there is a definition of 'program' in the university, the APT task force is using a broader definition, namely, "any activity in which the university invests resources."

Dr. Bilson advised that the APT task force co-chairs will post a weekly status update on the website. The most recent posting addresses the timetable laid out. The APT task force, similar to the SST task force, hopes to have a finalized template by mid-June for circulation and a deadline for submission of completed templates of August 16. Dr. Bilson acknowledged this as a fairly aggressive timetable. She advised that the primary concern is to allow the task force to review the programs in a balanced way and with the time needed.

Dr. Schneider noted that in addition to the co-chairs there are 47 other dedicated and exceptional individuals who are enthusiastic about the work of the task forces. This is a committee with a high quorum of 75% required for meetings, and 75% majority vote for any decisions related to categorization.

The Council Chair invited comments and questions for the TransformUS co-chairs.

A question was asked by a faculty member about the kinds of criteria and weightings that have been presented for the APT task force. The criteria for revenue and other resources, and costs and other expenses associated with the programs add up to 18%, whereas impact, justification and overall essentiality add up to 14%. The concern is that the reduction of programs to numerical criteria eliminates the judgment of the leap of intuition and possibility of future development, particularly for the humanities and social sciences.

Dr. Bilson advised that with the number of programs both task forces have to review, they needed to develop some type of criteria to compare the programs to each other. Both task forces recognize this will involve the exercise of judgment on how the programs will align with the university's stated priorities. The task forces are using the weightings and criteria as starting points to compare programs with each other, and there is room in the process to exercise judgment from a wide group of people so it will not be merely a numbers game.

The faculty member posing the question noted that the university's present areas of interest and concern change every four years, with each new integrated plan. A danger is that programs may be eliminated which may prove to be essential for the university's next integrated plan..

Dr. Tyler commented that although prioritizations are important, they are recommendations for others as it will still be the Council's task to recommend what programs to eliminate. The task forces are only making recommendations.

A student noted that the wording of the criteria was alarmingly ambiguous and asked how the task force will define the importance to the university. The student noted that some criteria were clearer than others, but a number were impossible to determine without direct input from the students, and asked how the task forces planned to address the ambiguity and obtain information from students who were underrepresented.

Dr. Tyler advised that the task forces will have each program/functional area tell us why they are important to the university. He noted that quality may be more difficult in some respects, although there are many measures of quality of support services at the university and more quantitative information than might be realized. Students provide impact on quality every time they complete course evaluations, so there is a lot of student input, and the task forces will look for more.

Dr. Kalynchuk advised that the APT task force was in the process of developing how it will measure quality and the processes it will follow. The task force has been separated into working groups to develop the template and it will be clear in the template what type of information is sought. She advised that they want to be careful to not seek information so specific that it prevents people from telling members why the program is important. She admitted that this is a difficult balance, and the task force is trying to identify the information necessary to gather. Dr. Bilson noted that every

program may view success in different ways, so the task force is considering asking the people responsible for programs to tell the task force what they think is a measure of success of their program, and why the program is distinctive.

Dr. Tyler noted that there will be lots of “apples and oranges” comparisons but this will have to be left to the people on the task force to work through, based on their experiences. Dr. Schneider advised that on the support services side, it is clear there is ambiguity, which the templates will assist to clarify. He noted that instruction will be given on how to complete the template, and the co-chairs are hoping the task force members will be able to assist in helping the community provide what the task force is looking for.

A concern was raised by a department head that written feedback does not elicit information to the extent a forum like Council does, and about the total timeline for this process, both because of the number of programs, but also due to timing. The task forces have been at work since March with a deadline to present a report by November 30<sup>th</sup>, so the majority of that time is in the summer when many people are away, and there is less opportunity for students to contribute. She also noted that she was concerned about the criteria being loosely defined. She expressed that general discussions provide a different type of environment for everyone, rather than isolated comments sent to the task force without a dynamic process for improvement.

Dr. Kalynchuk noted that the co-chairs had talked to a number of groups on campus (i.e. Deans’ Council twice, department heads, student town hall), so information had been gathered in public venues. She advised that there had also been other opportunities for discussions and others had participated, and that this discussion at Council was also very good.

The department head commented that even though there was the desire to have everyone become aware and participate, schedules and work responsibilities are such that it was difficult for a large percentage of the university community to acquaint themselves with matters that concern them. She recommended that this process be linked to the time allowed for the wider university community to become acquainted with it and emphasized the importance of a timeframe that allows for broad participation.

Dr. Bilson replied that co-chairs were very aware of the need to try to reach as many people as possible. Although the APT task force had set a deadline of April 22 for comment on the draft criteria and weightings, the website would remain open so that people could continue to acquaint themselves with the development of the process. To recognize the more communal dimension, public events and town halls will continue to be held at different steps in the process. She reminded members that TransformUS is an important project, but is also part of a larger strategy. There are timelines that are critical to the university to enable the university to respond to its financial responsibilities. Dr. Bilson noted that timing may be an issue, but there are limitations in light of the full trajectory of the budget process.

A faculty member advised that she was also concerned with timing and thought a definition of program should come out before the criteria is finalized, so individuals could determine whether or not they agreed with the program definition. She also raised a concern about the existence of the quintiles as bins and that the university was in jeopardy of losing very good people who leave because they see their program put into a negative bin.

Dr. Schneider reported that the SST task force was using Dickeson’s definition of program. The SST program lists have been developed, and the SST task force is close to being able to post these on the website and make them available for comment and review to get the right sense of what these support services are. Regarding the binning point, he commented the process will result in the categorization of programs, but many programs will be unaffected.

Dr. Bilson advised that the co-chairs do not underestimate the anxiety this initiative is causing. The task force members are committed to the process to put things in terms of higher and lower priorities and give the university community the opportunity to make choices given the financial resources available.

A graduate student commented that he was alarmed by the lack of discussion around bigger issues, such as the acceptance of having this process. He noted that at the town hall meeting yesterday it was said that these activities are necessary due to underfunding from the province; however, from the president's speech there was no criticism that the university is not getting as much money as hoped. He expressed the view that the problem was being downloaded from administration to faculty and students, and asked what type of lobbying and approach was being taken to represent the university to convince the government that more funding is needed. The chair advised that the president would speak to this question at the end of the task force item.

In response to a student's question about the external timelines that the task forces were aligning their timeline to, Professor Bilson advised that this is part of a larger sequence to come to terms with financial concerns.

A faculty member commented that he thought the purely financial weightings were dangerously low, given the desires of TransformUS, and he asked how the weightings of 18% and 21% were determined. In response Dr. Bilson explained that the weightings were the result of a lot of discussion by each task force at one-day workshops. She noted that the other part of it is that the quintiles, which are the categories that the programs will be placed in, are actually organized by financial characteristics because they will not put 20% of the number of programs in each quintile, but rather 20% of the amount of the university budget that the programs occupy. The categorization has a very powerful financial aspect, and the task forces' concern was to give sufficient room to other criteria, as they are confident the financial matters will be addressed.

There was a question about the specific dates envisioned for general discussion on the process between now and November. Dr. Kalynchuk advised that the co-chairs had not mapped out all of their events, but they did plan to have a few town halls with the university community around mid-May, once the draft templates are ready.

There was an observation that issues for one task force were not necessarily the same as the other task force, and for efficiency perhaps it would be appropriate to divide these sets of discussions in the future. Dr. Tyler thought that they would likely have the next town hall together, then hold separate town halls for this reason. Dr. Schneider noted that it has been useful so far for the co-chairs of both task forces to hear all of the comments. Dr. Kalynchuk commented that there is a significant link between the interests of both task forces, as the support services are part of the academic mission in some ways; however, she did think it is necessary to deal with them as separate entities.

A member of Senate commented that at the town hall meeting on the previous day, they were told about the gap between revenue and expenditures for the university. She observed that she was seeing investment from government declining and investment from corporate and private sources increasing. She asked how the desire for corporate investment was being evaluated, and how would it affect the task forces. The chair advised that the president would answer this question. Dr. Tyler also answered that the university's funding from the province is not decreasing as we are receiving a 2% increase, but it is just not as much as we had budgeted for, so there is a growing gap between the university's revenues and expenses.

A Senate member noted that at the town hall there was also a question as to whether there was representation of indigenous members on the task forces. Dr. Bilson replied that there are indigenous members on the task force; she just did not know how many.

The chair invited the president to respond to the two outstanding questions.

In response to the question asking what the administration was doing in the area of government relations in light of the fact of reduced government funding to the university, President Busch-Vishniac explained that universities in Saskatchewan and Manitoba had done well in provincial budgets, but funding for advanced education is either static or declining in all other provinces. So although the university is not receiving the funding it had hoped for, it is in no position to criticize the government as the province has increased funding at the rate of inflation and is leading in the country. She explained that administration is trying very hard to make sure it publicly thanks the province for being much more generous to its universities than in other provinces, and efforts continue to seek additional funding from the province.

Regarding the question about corporate dollars, Dr. Busch-Vishniac noted that if you look at funding that comes to this campus for our operating budget, about 75% comes from government, and about 1/10<sup>th</sup> of 1% comes from corporate sources. The amount of money received from corporations for our operating budget is sufficiently low that it does not pose a problem.

President Busch-Vishniac thanked the co-chairs and all of the other members of the task forces and those that participated in the discussion. She also thanked the staff of institutional planning and assessment who support the task forces. In closing the president noted that it is important that Council continue to have these types of discussion. The chair also thanked the co-chairs for their participation.

#### 9. College of Medicine: Update for information

President Busch-Vishniac provided an update on the process, in the provost's absence. She explained that the faculty of medicine accepted a new vision for the College of Medicine in November, and that a draft vision was approved by University Council in December with the requirement that Council be updated in April and a plan for the implementation of the vision be submitted by August. An update on progress being made by the College of Medicine had been provided to Council in the written meeting materials.

The president noted that the college of medicine affects each and every unit on this campus. At the General Assembly meeting last week, the president provided information on our research funding that illustrated if our medical college funding was at the same rate as our U15 peers, we would be at the median of our peers for research funds. She stressed that it is important for everyone that we keep on top of this process and are well informed.

Lou Qualtiere, acting Dean, College of Medicine and Martin Phillipson, vice-Provost, College of Medicine organizational restructuring were asked to provide comments on the summary provided in the materials.

Dr. Qualtiere advised that the report in the materials was illustrative of the work being done. Through the work of many working groups, recommendations have been tabled for the Deans' Advisory Committee (DAC) and DAC is currently waiting for the remaining reports from the other working groups. The work of the working groups has to be finished by the middle of June and an implementation plan needs to be developed by mid-August. Dr. Qualtiere explained this time is needed to develop the implementation plan and meet expectations of this body by the fall.

Mr. Phillipson introduced Dr. Colum Smith, interim vice-Dean of research, College of Medicine, and advised that Dr. Smith will release the research plan for the college in May. Mr. Phillipson explained that the implementation plan will be made up of smaller plans which will be constituted as chapters of the larger plan, and some will be circulated in advance. Mr. Phillipson explained that what was agreed in December was a fundamental restructuring of the college. The college will look



very different in five to ten years, and beyond, because it has been agreed that the status quo is not acceptable. A faculty meeting of the college has been called for June 26 to discuss progress. There were no questions or comments.

10. Planning and Priorities Committee

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

10.1 Request for Decision: Name Change for Department of Languages and Linguistics

Dr. Tyler provided context and background for the decision, summarizing the approval and consultation process that has been followed to date. He advised that the new name more accurately reflects the teaching of the department and would provide the positive impact of more visibility of what the department does.

TYLER/JAECK: That Council approve that the Department of Languages and Linguistics be renamed the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultural Studies, effective July 1, 2013.

CARRIED

10.2 Request for Decision: Establishment of PRISM (Proteomics Research in Interactions and Structure of Macromolecules) as a Type A Centre in the College of Medicine

Dr. Tyler explained the intent is to take advantage of centres to bring together researchers with common interests and that the PRISM centre will enhance the synergy among researchers engaged in protein science research. The Planning and Priorities Committee wanted to make sure the fit with the Saskatchewan Structural Sciences Centre and Canadian Light Source, as they provide similar tools, so obtained letters of support from both centres. The committee also asked whether it should be a Type A or Type B centre, and decided it should be a Type A centre within the College of Medicine in light of the support from the college. Dr. Tyler also noted the important linkage of PRISM with the Protein Characterization and Crystallization Facility, which is also located in the College of Medicine.

TYLER/KHANDELWAL: That Council approve the establishment of PRISM (Proteomics Research in Interactions and Structure of Macromolecules) as a Type A Centre in the College of Medicine, effective April 18, 2013.

CARRIED

11. Governance Committee

Professor Louise Racine presented these items as a member of the governance committee.

11.1 Request for Decision: Additional term to terms of reference for all Council committees

Prof. Racine provided the rationale for the additional term and summarized the approval and consultation process that had been followed. She explained that this additional term is for the terms of reference for all of the council committees and will allow committees at their

discretion to designate representatives on various administrative and other committees where deemed beneficial to the committee. Council committees are asked to report annually to council of any representatives named to committees.

RACINE/HARRISON: That Council approve the additional term ‘designating individuals to act as representatives of the committee on any other bodies, when requested, where such representation is deemed by the committee to be beneficial’ to the terms of reference for all Council committees.

CARRIED

11.2 Request for Decision: Disestablishment of the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Academic Support Committee and establishment of the Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee

Prof. Racine provided the rationale for the disestablishment of the two committees and creation of the new Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee and noted the consultation that had occurred. The new committee will result in more effective oversight of the academic supports fundamental to the successful delivery of academic programs and services, and will support the scholarship of teaching and learning, as articulated in the Learning Charter and Third Integrated Plan.

RACINE/TYLER: That Council disestablish the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Academic Support Committee, and in their place establish the Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee, with the proposed membership and terms of reference as attached.

CARRIED

11.3 Notice of Motion: Statement on Recording of Council Meetings in Part One, Section III, 5 of the Council Bylaws

Prof. Racine explained that the governance committee was asked to develop a statement regarding use of audio and video recording at council meetings and the committee determined that it should be included in the Council’s bylaws. The need for a statement on prohibiting recordings of Council meetings was prompted by the accessibility of recording technology and the need to protect the privacy of council members and allow them to participate freely in discussions. She noted that it does not restrict streaming to off-site locations if Council members are at those sites. Prof. Racine explained the consultation process followed.

The chair asked for any comments to be sent to Prof. Racine and Prof. Gord Zello, committee chair, and that the motion will come to the next Council meeting for decision.

RACINE/TYLER: That Council approve the addition of the following statement to Part One, Section III, 5 of the Council Bylaws: “Attendees at Council meetings are expected to refrain from audio or video recording of the proceedings and to respect the rulings of the chair.”

12. Nominations Committee

12.1 Request for Decision: Nominations for Search and Review Committees

Professor Ed Krol, member of the nominations committee, presented this report to Council.

The chair called three times for additional nominations from the floor. There being no further nominations the motions were put to Council.

KROL/MEDA: That Council approve the following nominations to Search and Review Committees:

Search Committee for Dean of Education  
Trevor Crowe, Associate Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research

Search Committee for Dean of Pharmacy and Nutrition:  
Louise Humbert, Associate Dean, College of Kinesiology

Review Committee for Dean of Agriculture and Bioresources:  
Don Bergstrom, Associate Dean, College of Engineering

CARRIED

14. Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee

14.1 Report for Information: Principles and Strategies for Research Success

Professor Stephen Urquhart, chair of the research, scholarly and artistic work committee presented the report on *Principles and Strategies for Research Success*. He noted that the report arises from discussions at the committee over the past two years on how to improve our research funding above the national average for medical-doctoral universities. This is a challenging goal and the metrics are sobering. Currently the university is at 11<sup>th</sup> place out of the U15 for total sponsored research funding in Canada and ranks at a similar level in terms of research funding per full time faculty. To move from 11<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> would require a difference of 40% of our current research funding. This matter falls within Council's responsibility to provide foresight and direction. The report provides a set of principles and recommended strategies for Council's consideration on how our research goal should be advanced. Dr. Urquhart noted that many thoughts of the committee parallel the thoughts of administration in this regard.

The chair invited comments on the report be provided to Dr. Urquhart and the research, scholarly and artistic work committee.

15. Other business

No other business was identified as arising from the minutes.

16. Question period

A question was directed to the provost's report, asking about the positions that had been eliminated by late March and early April, how that had gone, and how many reduced positions had been achieved through attrition.

In the absence of the provost, the president responded advising that the first phase of workforce planning involved the removal of 50 positions, 40 of which were full and 10 vacant. Another 50 positions were being eliminated, most of which are occupied, although recalling from memory, the president thought 12 positions were vacant. President Busch-Vishniac explained that they had intentionally decided to do this slowly to provide attention to each individual and provide them with support, rather than conduct mass terminations. She noted that it has been a difficult and painful process for everyone.

17. Adjournment

PARKINSON/MICHELMANN: That the meeting be adjourned at 4:38 p.m

CARRIED

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, May 16, 2013