

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

FOWLER-KERRY/DOBSON : To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

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

3. Minutes of the meeting of December 20, 2012

DOBSON/DETERS : That the Council minutes of December 20, 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

The chair invited President Busch-Vishniac to present her report. Dr. Busch-Vishniac indicated she would limit her comments to the matter of budget adjustments facing the university, a matter which has drawn a number of visitors to Council today. The president stressed the severity of the \$44.5M budget challenge that faces the university, and informed Council that despite some reports to the contrary, the university's budget has not been cut by the provincial government, but rather that the university's request has been trimmed down in response to the changing financial environment. The university, she said, has been generously treated by the government, and the province and the university enjoy a strong relationship. She remarked on the similarity of the university's situation to those in other jurisdictions, and particularly Ontario, whose universities have undergone much smaller increases in recent years. She assured Council that the university will live within its budget and is grateful for the relationship with government; we are the envy of our peers. The university's administration will do what it can to make compelling arguments for increased budgets, but when the budget comes down the university will live within it.

The president also indicated that given the structure of the institution's budget it is impossible to trim without affecting the staff complement, which makes up roughly 75% of the university's operating expenditures. Trims will need to be undertaken, and will be done so strategically and in

DRAFT until approved at the next meeting

accordance with the university's missions of educating students, discovering knowledge and serving the province. In order to accomplish this, the university has launched two projects: workforce planning and a process of prioritization called *TransformUS*.

With respect to workforce planning, the president commented on the immediate goal to trim roughly 40 positions; additional reductions will be required in subsequent phases to address what has become a structural budget deficit. The second project is meant to be a year-long study that will review all of the university's programs and activities against collectively established criteria and priorities. On the basis of those priorities there will be investment in some activities and disinvestment in others. Key to the success of the initiative will be that it is inclusive, fair, equitable and transparent.

The president then addressed a number of issues that she knows have been raised about the process. She began by clarifying that in her letter to the community, the statement that the task force membership would be 'selected' by the president should have read 'appointed' by the president. She stressed that she will not personally be selecting the membership; in fact the process for selection has not yet been determined, except that there will be an open nomination process. The president expressed her belief that there will be strong consensus candidates that will do a great job in their ability to look across the campus and run a fair, open process. A second rumour the president addressed was that 'decisions have already been made.' While she acknowledged that some units are bound to feel vulnerable, she stressed that criteria have not yet been established and there is no preconceived notion of the outcomes.

Dr. Busch-Vishniac also acknowledged the concerns that have been expressed to her by students who feel excluded from the process because student representation is not envisioned on the task forces. She explained the logic behind this thinking, which arises from the Dickeson model, in terms of the time commitment that is required. She also stressed that the task forces will not include the senior administration of the university either, and that the process is designed to solicit input from a broad base including students, faculty, staff, alumni, friends, employers and government. The criteria will come to Council and the Board for endorsement, and any actions arising from the process will go through our standard governance bodies, on which students are represented. With all of that said, the president acknowledged the importance of ensuring that the entire community sees this as a fair and open and equitable and inclusive process—so if it is the advice of Council today that students be added, that is what will be done. She ended by noting that this topic appears later on the agenda, and she would be happy to answer questions following her report or to defer them.

A member expressed concern that in this time of heightened anxiety, the Employee Assistance Program has a long waiting list and is booking appointments well into March.

A student visitor who identified herself as a previous Council member and a past president of the College of Education graduate students' association spoke in favour of inclusion of students on the task forces, defending students' right to decide for themselves whether they have time to be involved, and reminding Council that elected students have been involved in the Integrated Planning processes. She indicated that the university has a strong history of involving students and urged Council to support their inclusion on the task forces.

A member rose to object that the president's assurances that there are no preconceived notions of the outcome seems to be contradicted by the statement in the last paragraph on p. 90 of the agenda, which singles out the college of education and the humanities and fine arts. The president responded that the examples in the letter are a direct result of experience and represent examples that have been raised to her by the community. The provost explained how those examples came to be in the document; they arose from input in the form of suggestions and ideas that have been

solicited at town halls and on the web site. He committed to reviewing, examining and categorizing every idea that comes in as part of this process.

A member asked the president to comment on progress being made on restructuring in the College of Medicine. The president indicated that she has come to understand that the difficulties for the College relate in large measure to a structure that is not appropriate for the province, one in which the health regions are responsible for health care without corresponding authority and funding, and the university has both funding and authority to hire clinicians but no responsibility for health care. She stressed the need to identify a sustainable solution in partnership with the government and health regions, and that these discussions have already begun. She invited vice-provost Martin Phillipson to comment; he confirmed that efforts are underway to identify common points of interest with these partners, and that a position paper is being developed with the health region. He noted that much of the current activity relates to matters of compensation and distributed education, and told Council that a bi-monthly newsletter is being planned, as well as a full report to the April meeting of Council.

A member expressed skepticism about the commitment to a 'fair, transparent, inclusive' process, referencing last fall's special GAA meeting at which members were lined up at the microphone to dispute the claim that the process concerning the restructuring of the College of Medicine had been transparent. He suggested that those who promise the world always receive funding at the expense of more disciplined units.

Another member asked about the workforce planning initiative, and particularly whether this is a one-time immediate reduction that will take place just this year and will end in 2013. The president indicated that the immediate reductions will be mostly achieved in 2013, but that at the end of this year there will be a report that will allow the university to prioritize programs, and that there will be further reductions as a result of that exercise.

A visitor asked why a program prioritization process is required when for several decades the university has had a process by which every program has been evaluated at a fixed interval by external evaluators who are experts in the field. Those reports, he said, are available to everybody and departments have already been evaluated. At the president's request, the provost responded. He indicated that the reference is to systematic program review, and then addressed the difference between a budget prioritization process and an academic review process. These, he said, have some similarities but are fundamentally different. The questions they ask are different: not, 'is this good?' or 'how could it be better?' but rather 'what priority will the institution be giving this program in budget allocation?' Systematic program review (SPR) was undertaken over five years and did a good job of what it was set up to do for academic programs. Its evaluations were summative. Almost all programs on the campus cleared the bar; a few got Ds but almost every program got a B, with a few A's and a few C's. The bell curve was narrow and tight. A second thing SPR did was to provide formative feedback about ways in which a program could be better, and this has affected some decisions and timing since then. There was some hope this would guide financial decision making, but it did not produce feedback that was useful in this respect. One similarity to program prioritization is that SPR focused on programs, not units. A premise of program prioritization is that units exist to support programs and not the other way around; thus, the review will focus on programs, rather than the units that house them. The provost also reminded Council that the results of SPR are now almost 10 years old.

Another visitor asked how the Dickeson model was chosen, indicating that he had contacted his colleagues at the University of Colorado and heard reports that that university had been censured by the American Association of University Professors for using this process, and that Dr. Dickeson himself had been relieved of his presidency because he couldn't handle the financial dimensions of his position. The president noted that the Dickeson model has been successfully applied in Canada,

in Europe, and in the US, and is the only model that has been shown to produce results. The provost dismissed *ad hominem* attacks on Dr. Dickeson, indicating that the university is choosing a methodology rather than an individual, and that the choice is about the idea and the track record. He also indicated that this method, which has both advantages and disadvantages to others that might be used, will be adapted and tailored to the needs of the University of Saskatchewan.

6. Report of the Provost

Dr. Fairbairn commended members to his written report and drew Council's attention in particular to the two-part Aboriginal symposium taking place on March 15 and June 12, and the opening of the university's offices at Station 20 West in one of Saskatoon's core neighbourhoods.

The provost then made some general comments about budget adjustments, contextualizing the issues at this university as similar to those being faced by colleagues across the country. He noted that an important difference in our case is that the required adjustments are of a similar magnitude but over four years. The university has the forecasting tools to look ahead four years, and to plan for the reductions we know will be necessary by 2016 in order to become a more sustainable institution.

Dr. Fairbairn also announced that town halls will be scheduled at regular intervals for updates on the progress of operating budget adjustments. The next one is scheduled for Tuesday, February 26 at 12:30 pm in Convocation Hall. He anticipates the presentation will include an overview of the structure of the budget adjustment process and discussion of where all the projects fit into this. He reminded Council that there is a steering committee to oversee the project itself; one of its important tasks is to receive and review the ideas and suggestions that are sent in from across the campus community.

The chair invited comments and questions for the provost.

Professor Michael MacGregor identified himself as co-chair, along with Barb Daigle, of the university Employee Assistance Plan management board. He indicated that the board is well aware of the problems identified by a member earlier in the meeting and has developed a triage process to address the needs of those who are in crisis situations. The board is in the process of hiring another counselor to address the 4-week wait times. He encouraged members to let him know if they hear of problems with the program.

Another member referenced a story in the January 21st edition of *On Campus News* regarding the possible construction of a hotel on the college quarter. He expressed concern that the location under discussion is the current site of the seed barn and the beach volleyball court, and wondered whether there were plans to tear down the seed barn, given its historic nature. The provost invited Vice-president Finance and Resources Greg Fowler to respond; Mr. Fowler indicated that the university is actively investigating the possibility of relocation and alternative uses for the seed barn.

7. Student societies

7.1 Report from the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union

USSU President Jared Brown invited Academic Vice-presidents Ruvimbo Kanyemba, Vice-president Operations Steven Heidel, and Vice-president External Alex Verenka to join him as he presented a verbal report on recent activities of the USSU.

Mr. Brown began by addressing a question that was asked at the last meeting concerning the policies the USSU has in place about free speech. He reminded Council that the Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms had written a report in which the USSU was given a

failing grade; he has subsequently spoken to representatives of the centre, who indicated they were unaware of some of the existing initiatives and policies of the USSU. The executive is ensuring that their policies are up to date and reflect their practices in this regard.

Mr. Brown also reported on various initiatives that the executive members have been working on, including a student symposium earlier today, a recent ‘speed friending’ event, a campus groups survey and a meeting of college presidents. He then turned to the issue of student representation on the *TransformUS* task forces, referring Council members to page 90 of the agenda materials. Leading Council members through each of the four reasons given for students not being included, he argued that students should be able to choose to participate based on their own time management; that just as he ensures successful transition for the next USSU president as a board member, a student representative could ensure successful transition for a student replacing him on a committee; that students have no more conflict of interest (and possibly less) than do the faculty members who have a stake in developing academic programs and who rely on them for their own research; and that many students who have been involved in student government have a broader view of the macro level of the institution than many faculty do. Mr. Brown received applause for his report, and the chair opened the floor for comments and questions.

A faculty member expressed interest in the students’ position on conflict of interest, indicating that since the institution has a responsibility to ensure all students currently in enrolled in a program can complete it, students may be the only ones who are not in a conflict of interest. He agreed with the students that it is difficult not to hear the objections to their involvement as paternalistic, but defended the need for continuity through the task forces’ work.

The Chair invited members of Council to join him in thanking members of the USSU executive for a very thorough report.

7.2 Report from the Graduate Students’ Association

GSA Academic Vice-president Dylan Beach and GSA Vice-president External Elizabeth O’Meara extended regrets from GSA President Ehimai Ohiozebou, and presented an oral report on the activities of the Graduate Students’ Association.

Mr. Beach reported that he has been in conversation with the Minister of Advanced Education to advocate for the inclusion of graduate students in the province’s graduate retention program. He also reported that there would be a vote at the GSA Council meeting later this evening to approve a referendum for a U-PASS for graduate students.

Ms. O’Meara informed Council that a graduate student gala is planned for Friday, March 8 to honour graduate students and the faculty and staff who have supported them; she encouraged departments to consider purchasing a table to recognize their graduate students by contacting the association’s office manager at gsa.admin@usask.ca or at the GSA Commons. All proceeds will be put towards graduate student bursaries. A number of excellence awards will be presented, including one for an exceptional advisor and a GSA champion.

The Chair invited members of Council to join him in thanking Mr. Beach and Ms. O’Meara for their report.

8. Nominations Committee

The vice-chair of the nominations committee, Ed Krol, presented the committee's report to Council.

8.1 Request for Decision: Committee nominations

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

KROL/PAIN: That Council approve the nomination of Carolyn Tait, Psychiatry, to the research, scholarly and artistic work committee for a term ending June 30, 2016.

CARRIED

8.2 Request for Decision: Member of the Renewals and Tenure Appeal Panel

KROL/PAIN: That Council approve that Phyllis Shand, Food and Bioproduct Sciences, be nominated to the renewals and tenure appeal panel for a term ending June 30, 2014.

CARRIED

8.3 Request for Decision: Members of the Search Committee of the Vice-President (Finance and Resources)

KROL/PAIN: That Council approve the following nominations to the Search Committee for the Vice-president Finance and Resources: Dean McNeill, Department of Music, and Andrew Van Kessel, Department of Animal and Poultry Sciences.

CARRIED

9. Academic Programs Committee

Roy Dobson, chair of the academic programs committee, presented the committee's report to Council.

9.1 Request for Decision: Curricular Approval Process Revisions

In presenting the motion, Professor Dobson verbally corrected the date of the Academic Programs Committee meeting referenced in the Request for Decision.

Professor John Rigby spoke to the importance of this motion as having come out of the second integrated plan and particularly the commitment to streamline curricular approval processes. Dr. Rigby commended the work of Russell Isinger and his team in the office of the Registrar in moving these improvements forward.

DOBSON/ZELLO: That Council approve the revised Framework for Approval of Academic and Curricular Changes at the University of Saskatchewan.

CARRIED

9.2 Request for Decision: Arts and Science: Termination of Bachelor of Arts programs in Studies in Religious Traditions

Professor Dobson introduced the motion by explaining the reasons for the termination of these programs.

DOBSON/ZELLO: That Council approve the termination of Bachelor of Arts programs in Studies in Religious Traditions.

CARRIED

9.3 Items for Information

The following items were received for information:

- new concentration in Language and Speech Sciences and name change for existing concentration to General and Applied Linguistics in the BA Four-year in Linguistics;
- new concentration in Conducting/Music Education in the Master of Music;
- program name change to Religion and Culture in BA programs of the Department of Religion and Culture.

10. Planning and Priorities Committee

This report was presented by planning and priorities committee chair, Dr. Bob Tyler.

10.1 Request for Decision: Name for the school of professional development

Dr. Tyler provided context and background for the decision, summarizing the approval and consultation process that has been followed to date.

TYLER/ MEDA: That Council approve that the school of professional development be named *School of Professional Development, College of Engineering*, and that Council's Bylaws be amended to reflect the name of the school.

CARRIED

10.2 Request for Decision: Program Prioritization

Dr. Tyler began by clarifying what a motion to approve in principle means, reading from the guidelines adopted by Council for motions and decisions. He noted that the motion intentionally avoids specifics, since any more specific outcomes of the process for program prioritization that are under Council's authority will be brought to Council at a later date for approval. He also clarified that the motion encompasses a process for both administrative and academic program prioritization. He explained that his remarks would focus on why the planning and priorities committee is recommending approval by Council, and that he would also speak to some specific aspects of the establishment of task forces and Council's possible role. He emphasized that his comments are made on behalf of the entire committee, which is strongly supportive of the university undertaking a process of program prioritization; he also indicated that he sensed a high level of support at yesterday's joint meeting with the academic programs committee.

Dr. Tyler then addressed the matter of why Council approval should be sought for this initiative, referencing Council's legislative authority and influence over academic matters. It is in the interest of the university and of Council that decisions are based on a clearly

articulated and systematic process. He advised that even if Council decides not to support this motion, some form of prioritization will take place, and reiterated the view of the committee that Council should be involved as a participant in the process.

With respect to the establishment of task forces, Professor Tyler noted that his committee has spent a lot of time talking about various options for composition of the task forces and has sought input from other committees. Consideration has been given to how the task force members should be selected, the appropriate selection criteria, how to make the process transparent, what Council's role should be in approving criteria, and whether there will be students on the task force. Options included either seeking broadly-based nominations from the community, or keeping the process within the existing committees and processes of Council, as well as some hybrids of the two. There are advantages and disadvantages to all models: the Council-only model is attractive, but the committee was concerned that Council would lose its arm's-length status and ability to critique, and that most Council members did not sign on with this intensive process in mind, as well as the fact that there will be significant turnover of Council committee membership at the end of June.

The chair then opened the floor to debate on the motion, which reads as follows:

TYLER/FAIRBAIRN: That Council approve in principle the undertaking of a process for program prioritization.

Referencing a statement on p. 85 of the agenda, a member sought clarification about how deeply the task forces intend to review the institutional mission; Dr. Tyler responded that 'reviewing' should be read as 'understanding' or 'incorporating' rather than 'revising.'

The same member described the students' arguments for inclusion on the task force as persuasive. Asking for a show of hands from Council members about how many of them are U of S graduates, he encouraged the president and provost to consider that students are our future faculty and should be participants in the institution's future.

Another member also began by urging the president to appoint graduate and undergraduate representation. He then asked whether it is their intent that the committee will have a sunset clause, or whether this would be an ongoing process and if so what the implications of that would be. The provost clarified that the reason these are referred to as 'task forces' is that they have a single task, the creation of a set of priorities, to accomplish. When this task is done, the task forces will be dissolved. Dr. Tyler suggested that universities should always have processes for program prioritization and in this respect it is unfortunate that the project is being driven by budgetary considerations. Once a process is in place, he argued, it should be continued as the institution is faced with similar issues in the future.

A visitor who identified herself as a graduate student at the university addressed the matter of conflict of interest on the part of students and faculty, and suggested that the administration also has a conflict of interest. Noting that the GSA report did not even mention TransformUS, she also spoke in support of student involvement provided that the USSU and GSA consult extensively with students.

The president of the student medical society, also a visitor to Council, spoke in favour of the motion to include students; having sat on the dean's advisory committee for renewal in the College of Medicine she said that she and many elected officials are often willing to commit much more than 4-6 hours per week to such projects.

A visitor who identified himself as a law student expressed skepticism about the proposed methodology and warned of the possibility for systemic bias. He advocated for an opportunity to evaluate the methodology before it is applied, and urged Council to reject the process until it includes formal representation from students. Referring to a recent poll in *The Sheaf*, he rejected the arguments put forward to exclude students. He also argued that if student representation is sought it should not be solely from the USSU or GSA but should come from a broad solicitation students who are interested and willing to participate.

The chair then invited the provost to speak as the seconder of the motion. Dr. Fairbairn addressed three questions: whether the university should undertake a process of prioritization, what would happen if Council does not approve this process in principle, and how such a process should be undertaken. He noted that the third of these questions has been the topic of most of the discussion today. Observing that one speaker had used the word 'crisis' he submitted that nothing that takes four years to address is a crisis, by definition. If this were truly a crisis, program prioritization would not be the appropriate solution. The university is not in a financial crisis, but it can look four years ahead and see that there is a serious financial issue on the horizon: this is an important distinction.

Addressing the law student's comment, he drew attention to the importance of criteria. These have not yet been determined; that will be the job of the task forces. Like others, he indicated that he sees the development, definition and weighting of criteria as the strategically important part of this process. Once developed, these will be brought back for discussion and if timing allow in other forums to get exactly the input that was suggested. The provost also told Council that he is committed not to being a task force member, and so Council is also his opportunity to provide feedback about the criteria.

Addressing the question of what happens if Council does not undertake this process, the provost noted that the fallback solution would be approaches that are administratively more expedient, such as arbitrary across-the-board cuts or hiring freezes and tuition increases. He recalled that in one of the previous rounds of budget pressures, he was a new faculty member in the college of Arts and Science, and was disheartened to see his department lose its German historian because the position happened to be vacant at the time the budget cuts were happening. No-one had made any conscious decision about priorities at that time. The provost urged Council to support the investment of time in systematic processes that identify priorities and follow through on them.

The provost also followed up on the matter of timing and continuity, noting that the task forces will need to start and finish their work in 2013, but that the notion of prioritization should be kept alive and incorporated into our institution beyond this calendar year as a means of becoming financially sustainable. If Council does not approve the process, the administration will still have a responsibility to the Board of Governors, which oversees the financial health of the university, to come up with some way to prioritize programs. While he acknowledged that he has not heard many people say we should not be doing any kind of program prioritization, it is nevertheless possible that issues about how we do it may be getting in the way of peoples' support. He therefore proposed a friendly amendment that might take account of these 'how' issues, and particularly the way the task forces are selected and the importance of student representation.

The motion was restated with the approval of the mover and seconder as follows:

TYLER/FAIRBAIRN: That Council approve in principle the undertaking of a process for program prioritization;

And that following an open nomination process the task force for academic prioritization be constituted to include 20-25 faculty members and 2 students;

And that the selection of the task force be made in consultation with the leadership of University Council.

A visitor asked whether the language of the motion makes it sufficiently clear that the membership of the task force is exclusively faculty and students. She also suggested that since the provost has indicated the university is not in a financial crisis, perhaps the administrative task force could complete its work prior to the work of the academic task force. Otherwise, she said, as soon as Council approves this, it has approved academic program cuts.

A student visitor asked how the two students would be chosen and recommended that this be done by the USSU and the GSA. The provost indicated that the appointment would be made by the president and that while it is difficult to establish a process in a meeting like this, consultation would certainly occur with the USSU and GSA.

A member asked how a 'faculty member' would be defined, expressing concern that after the nomination process is closed it is entirely conceivable that the committee could comprise only senior administrators who are faculty members. The president offered assurances that there will be no-one appointed to the task force above the rank of department chair. She also explained why simply having an election process to determine the membership of the task forces does not work; there must be some selection to ensure balanced and broadly-based representation and to ensure the task forces are not heavily weighted against individuals who feel they have 'turf to protect'.

Another visitor to Council spoke against the Dickeson model, alleging that the author believes universities should be run like corporations and that department heads should be eliminated and replaced by managers. He argued for a 'made-in-Saskatchewan' solution, and he invited the president to account the contradictions between her statement that 'there are no sacred cows' and statements made elsewhere that the College of Medicine will be our flagship, and about the importance of food security to the university.

A member of Council who said she would not be supporting the motion referenced a graph shown at the October meeting that showed how much the administrative personnel has increased at the university in the last decade. She expressed a lack of faith that the process of program prioritization will be any more transparent than workforce adjustments have been.

The mover of the motion reminded Council that the motion references 'a process' and that any methodology adopted by the university will need to be adapted to reflect our own institutional values.

A member of Council commented that the discussion has really been about 'how' rather than 'whether' to do program prioritization, and that the main point to resolve is how Council is to be involved. He suggested that the first part of the motion be dealt with today, and that the planning and priorities committee be asked to come back with the 'how' part and more clarification at another meeting with respect to the long-term involvement of Council. The provost responded that it is indeed the case that people want to talk about 'how' before they deal with 'whether', and conceded that it would be logical to separate these discussions. He asked to hear more from members about what they would support.

A member expressed the view that this is an important decision and should have come to Council this month for information and next month for decision. The provost indicated he would leave it to Council's leaders to comment on the appropriate procedure but reminded Council that he has stood up in every Council meeting since October to encourage people to read the Dickeson book, and to think about the models for program prioritization. He urged against taking more months to study the issue, suggesting that the flaws in our decision-making processes are usually not that we take too short a time to make decisions but that we take too long.

A member of Council spoke in favour of the motion because of the things that have been said about our alternatives. The prospect of budget cuts is very real and not something that can be ignored.

The chair then invited the mover to make concluding remarks. Dr. Tyler described the motion as being akin to a statement of intent. He echoed the provost's contention that the university has been well educated on this process already, and reminded Council that it is not being called on to approve specific actions. He also suggested that the modifications made to the wording of the motion be further amended to reduce the specificity of "20-25 members" and "2 students."

The motion was restated once more with the approval of the mover and seconder as follows:

TYLER/FAIRBAIRN: That Council approve in principle the undertaking of a process for program prioritization;

And that following an open nomination process the task force for academic prioritization be constituted to include faculty members and undergraduate and graduate students;

And that the selection of the task force be made in consultation with the leadership of University Council.

CARRIED

11. Governance Committee

Dr. Gordon Zello presented this report as chair of the governance committee, reminding Council that the motion before them was brought as a Notice of Motion in December.

11.1 Request for Decision: Proposed faculty council membership for the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy

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

CARRIED

12. Other business

12.1 Item for Information: Records Management Policy

John Rigby, one of Council's representatives to the Policy Oversight Committee, presented this item for information.

13. Question period

A member rose to observe that Council had today heard a member of the faculty who is not a Council member make denigrating statements about one of our colleges, and a member make denigrating statements about a leader of a political party in another country, and remarked that at a previous meeting there had been an invitation made for Council members to participate in a political event. He urged the chair and leadership of Council to make a more forceful statement about the conduct expected of members and visitors, and to ensure that Council meetings are focused on Council's business.

14. Adjournment

The chair reminded members that next month's Council meeting will be the last one for the current University Secretary, and that there will be a reception for her following the next meeting. He also asked members to encourage their colleagues to run for one of the 17 vacancies on Council for next year.

DOBSON/HARRISON: That the meeting be adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

CARRIED

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, February 28, 2013.

If you are unable to attend this meeting please send regrets to: Lesley.Leonhardt@usask.ca