

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

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

A tribute to Dr. Allan Backman, School of Public Health, was presented by Dr. John Rigby, associate professor and head of the Department of Management and Marketing. A moment of silence was observed.

1. Adoption of the agenda

KULSHRESTHRA/D. BRENNNA: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra welcomed members and visitors and explained the process for debate and discussion at the Council meeting. Voting members were invited to sit in the center section and non-voting members and guests to sit on the side sections. The chair advised that those individuals wanting to speak are to be recognized by the chair and are to identify their name and whether they are a member of Council. Generally, Council members have first priority to speak. Dr. Kalra noted the items to be addressed at Council and introduced the student representatives on Council.

3. Minutes of the meeting of September 19, 2013

D'EON/ALBRITTON: That the Council minutes of September 19, 2013 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

In response to a request by the chair, Elizabeth Williamson, university secretary, provided comments on admission numbers. She advised that under *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995*, Council has the power to prescribe and limit the number of students who may be admitted to a college and also has the ability to delegate this power. University Council has delegated the setting of admission numbers to faculty councils under its bylaws. Target numbers need not be submitted to University Council for approval, but need to be approved at the faculty council level and then reported to Council. The university secretary advised that her office is working with the Provost's office to determine an efficient way to collect reports from faculty councils regarding admission numbers, and the reporting will likely come through the planning and priorities or academic programs committee. She also noted that there is an expectation that a foundational document on strategic enrolment management (SEM) will come to University Council for approval within the next two years. Once the SEM foundational document is approved by University Council and Senate in accordance with Council's and Senate's bylaws, colleges are to manage their enrolment in accordance with the approved plan.

The university secretary encouraged colleges in the meantime to continue to take a collegial approach with consultation regarding enrolment changes occurring among affected colleges.

5. Report of the President

President Ilene Busch-Vishniac spoke briefly about the College of Medicine being put on probation, noting the college is the only medical school in Canada to be placed on probation twice. The president noted that there are great faculty, clinicians and scientists in the College of Medicine, but that changes are needed, and these will take time. She informed Council that the university chose to be transparent with the public and announced the college being placed on probation upon being informed by the accrediting bodies. The president noted that the model for the College of Medicine that was created 60 years ago is not working in current times and has resulted in a broken governance structure because the responsibility for health care belongs to the health regions rather than the university. The president noted that there is a good understanding with the provincial government that change is necessary and that the university continues to work with its partners to find a win for everyone.

The president noted that there is a new former provincial Minister of Advanced Education, Rob Norris, who knows the university and the leadership of the institution and is familiar with the role. There is also a new federal Minister of Industry, James Moore, who obtained his master's degree at the University of Saskatchewan; the president noted she met with Minister Moore recently in Ottawa as well as with the new Minister of State for Western Economic Diversification, Minister Rempel. The president noted that post-secondary education was not featured in either of the recent federal and provincial throne speeches.

The president noted that October is a very busy month in terms of governance for the university as Board, Senate and Council all meet in October. This provides a good opportunity to be in touch with every constituency that plays a role in governance at the university. She noted that at the upcoming Fall Convocation the university's new Chancellor, Blaine Favel, will be installed in the morning and there are a number of people receiving awards and two honorary degrees at the ceremonies. The president encouraged faculty to attend Convocation noting that this is a time of celebration.

A Council member inquired about the transmittal letter regarding the College of Medicine and was advised that the letter is on the College of Medicine website and was posted the day it was received, Friday, October 18, 2013.

A Council member asked a question regarding TransformUS noting that at the General Academic Assembly in Spring he had asked for assurances that the costs of service teaching would be taken into account properly. He noted that in August the co-chairs directed the template preparers to roll those costs into items that had nothing to do with teaching and asked what assurances could be given that this would be corrected. The president noted that no one above the level of department head has been allowed to serve on the task forces so she did not have information regarding this and asked whether one of the co-chairs present wished to respond. Lisa Kalynchuk, co-chair of the academic task force, informed Council that the template has a section where units can indicate the amount of teaching done in each unit and the task force feels certain that it has enough information to assess service teaching in each program and this will be reflected in the task force reports.

A Council member commended the process for development of the Vision 2025 statement as an open process. He suggested that the word "spirit" in the title be replaced with "aspiration" as he believed this word to be closer to the nature of academic work.

6. Report of the Provost

As Brett Fairbairn, provost and vice-president academic, was unable to attend the meeting, the president indicated she would answer any questions on behalf of Dr. Fairbairn regarding his written report. No questions or comments were raised.

7. Student Societies

7.1 Report from the USSU

Max FineDay, president of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union, presented an oral report on the Open Textbook Program campaign. He explained that open textbooks, as implemented in British Columbia, put the 40 most popular textbooks online for students to access online with no cost. The USSU is lobbying the provincial government and is having conversations with administration regarding how to do something similar in Saskatchewan. He noted that there is a petition with nearly 800 signatures so far from students, faculty and others in our campus community supporting open textbooks. Mr. FineDay advised that the way textbooks are available now is not working for students.

Mr. FineDay spoke to the following implications to professors and faculty:

- Faculty will continue to choose which textbooks they use;
- There is agreement that we want to see students succeed, and an open textbook program is a way to do that;
- The cost for post-secondary education is prohibitive and the cost of textbooks is among the top three to four costs for students;
- Professors will be able to customize textbooks allowing more local content;
- Both the governments of Washington State and British Columbia have invested approximately \$1.0 M to similar initiatives, and Washington State has already seen savings of \$3.5M for their students;
- The hope is that professors will have open discussions with students in their classrooms regarding open textbooks;
- The petition being circulated by the USSU will be presented to Minister Norris and is available at the meeting today if anyone would like to sign it.

A Council member asked Mr. FineDay if he would prefer free tuition or an open textbook situation, to which Mr. FineDay advised that he would like to have both but noted tuition is the biggest cost for students. The USSU believes in affordable tuition and if ever the possibility of free tuition became available, the USSU would be very happy to see this.

A Council member noted that the front page story in the Sheaf on October 17th was about freedom of expression on campus and expressed his appreciation and thanks to the USSU for what they are doing in support of freedom of expression.

7.2 Report from the GSA

Ehimai Ohiozebau, president of the Graduate Students' Association reported to Council. He supported the USSU in regards to the open textbook policy on campus noting that he believes it would be beneficial to all stakeholders.

He noted that there are both thought-based and research-based graduate students as part of

the GSA, and those in the thought-based programs have partnered with Student and Enrolment Services Division to have a series of industry talks that would be of interest to those in thought-based programs. Mr. Ohiozebau also noted that the GSA is organizing a congress on March 6-7, 2014, with a gala on March 8th. The purpose of the congress is to provide a forum for University of Saskatchewan and Canadian graduate students to present their scholarship and research in a peer-reviewed session. The desire is to create an event where all graduate students will be able to display their research.

8. Planning and Priorities Committee

Dr. Fran Walley, chair of the planning and priorities committee, presented the committee reports to Council.

8.1 Report for information: Vision 2025: *From Spirit to Action*

Dr. Walley advised that the planning and priorities committee is submitting the Vision 2025 document to Council for information and discussion on behalf of President Busch-Vishniac. She noted that bringing it here is also a signal that the author is seeking input on direction and depth from all corners of the university to ensure it is a vision of our university collective. Dr. Walley advised that the document is a work in progress and will become an institutional statement for the university's broadest goals and objectives and lay a path for future plans. The intention is for the vision document to come back to Council for endorsement in Spring 2014.

Dr. Walley advised that the planning and priorities committee met with the president to discuss the draft vision statement. The committee's discussion focused on the reflection of student's financial needs, the value statements in the document, the degree of Aboriginal support structures, and that a "sense of place" should encompass the North, in addition to "prairie resourcefulness".

The chair asked President Busch-Vishniac to come forward to provide comments on the vision document. The president advised that her key aims are to make sure the document reflects institutional aims and not her aims alone. The desire is to think far enough out to reflect institutional goals and aspirations to help guide the development of the university's fourth and fifth integrated plans. She expressed she would like to make the vision reflect the university and its uniqueness. The president described the process she followed in developing the document, including creating a list of questions which was circulated to senior leaders of the university. From that list the president wrote a 17 page document that was reviewed by the Senior Leadership Forum in August. Based on comments from this body, the vision document was edited significantly and then shared again with the Senior Leadership Forum and Council chairs. It has also gone to the Board, Senate and now University Council--all in October. The vision document is also posted on the university website, with an invitation for comments and feedback. A town hall to present the draft vision document is scheduled for next week, and the aim is to finalize the document by Spring 2014.

The president noted that she believed the process is working, as one paragraph in the document has prompted the vast majority of responses. She drew Council's attention to the paragraph on the fifth page of the document speaking to partnership with Aboriginal communities and noted that it is not being interpreted in the sense she had intended, and therefore the paragraph will be rewritten. The paragraph currently says that the university presently has programs for Aboriginal students and programs for non-Aboriginal students. Having integrated programs for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students has been suggested as

a future goal. The president advised that this has been perceived as a threat to some of the university's very successful Aboriginal programs, which was not what she had intended. The president noted that as a woman in the male-dominated fields of engineering and science disciplines, she knows that the intended end-state is to have equal pay for equal work and equal representation of women in all fields. However, with respect to equity of Aboriginal peoples, we do not yet know the desired end state. The aim is not to cut highly successful programs but to ask what will equity look like many years down the road in a province that will be majority Aboriginal with a university that will also likely be majority Aboriginal. The president noted that she is open to all comments on this issue and any others in the document.

A Council member noted that he was surprised to see no reference to trusts or endowments in the document and felt that they are linked as universities use their trusts and endowments to support their research. Another member was struck by the fact that there is no reference to the Fine Arts or artistic work in the document. He expressed that he thought it important to include this because this province and city have had a very strong historical record as ground breakers in this area and therefore it should be included in the sense of place of this university. In support of his statement, he provided examples of where the university, the city, and the province have been at the forefront of artistic endeavours, including the creation of the Kenderdine campus in 1936. He noted that he believed this has led to a city that is vibrant in its arts environment with art museums and theatres often funded by alumni. The president noted that when she shortened the document, this reference was inadvertently lost, and the document should refer to research, scholarly and artistic work.

A Council member asked that the president clarify the process around approval of the document and whether it will be revised and come back to University Council for approval. The president advised that she is seeking as many comments as possible and will revise the documents in response, noting that she will not be able to make everyone happy. She also does not want to lose the edge that the vision document currently has. The document will come back to Board, University Council and Senate for endorsement of all three governing bodies.

A Council member recommended that the paragraph under "our place in the post-secondary landscape" about attributes be removed as it suggests we are legislating how people ought to behave.

A Council member noted that on page two the document refers to principles that will guide our future and includes "learning and discovery"; he commended the president for including these as outcomes rather than activities.

A Council member noted that his major concern is that the document has come out of the blue and the process is already one of talking back to the document. He noted that a vision should come from the people, not top-down but bottom-up and his suggestion was to start from scratch and ask the people that work and study here what their fundamental values are. He also advised that he thought the vision document should be a set of principles and this document reads as a planning document not a vision document.

A Council member noted that he was sensitive to the portion of the document speaking to gratuitous duplication and asked the president what she meant by the reference to gratuitous duplication on page two of the document. The president advised that this has also been identified as a sensitive point and needs to be rewritten. She noted that there are many reasons why having more than one program in the province is justified in that they serve different purposes, take different approaches or the program demand is too high to be met by one institution. The president noted that her point was that she did not want to grow

programs just to grow programs but rather there needs to be a clear business case to grow a program.

There being no further comments, the president invited Council members to go to her website and provide comments online.

8.2 Report for information: *The Way Forward: Implementation Plan for the College of Medicine*

The chair, being a member of the College of Medicine, asked the vice-chair, Hans Michelmann to chair this portion of the Council meeting.

Dr. Fran Walley advised that the implementation plan for the College of Medicine was being presented for information to Council as a follow-up to Council's previous decision to approve in principle the college's vision document. In December 2012 the document, *A New Vision for the College of Medicine*, was presented to University Council and approved in principle. At that time it was recognized, the vision document set forward a vision for the college but was not a comprehensive plan. Council therefore required the development of an implementation plan, which would address the criteria established by the planning and priorities committee for assessment of any renewal plan for the college.

Dr. Walley advised that the implementation is the responsibility of the dean and dean's executive. Council is concerned with academic programs and college structures that house the academic programs. Although the plan paints a picture of what may be implemented, the steps taken to implement the plan still need to be determined. Council has already approved in principle the vision for the changes, but as these changes are either not within the purview of Council or are not fully formed, the report is being presented to Council for information rather than approval.

Dr. Walley listed the criteria against which the committee evaluated the plan as reported earlier to Council as follows:

- The renewal plan will propose a governance structure that will address the concerns of the accrediting bodies within one year. In the near term, the proposed structure will assure the accrediting bodies that accountability issues are being addressed effectively.
- The proposed governance structure will support the change process that the college must undergo if it is to increase its level of research activity substantially over the next five years.
- The renewal plan will provide Council with a reasonable level of confidence that the desired outcomes will be achieved, along with some sense of the milestones and metrics that will be employed to measure and monitor the extent and trajectory of progress over the next five years.
- The renewal plan can be implemented without additional resources from the university and it will include a strategy for resource allocation from the college's responsibilities and among the respective agencies responsible for academic activities and provisional of clinical services.
- The renewal plan will include a description of the process employed in its development, including the degree of engagement of the College of Medicine Faculty Council in addition, the level of College of Medicine Faculty Council support for the renewal plan will be documented.

Dr. Walley advised that members of the planning and priorities committee were of the opinion that the plan addresses the criteria set out and conveys the message of general support. She noted that the plan sets out the 'what' and the 'how' is yet to be determined. There is the expectation that explicit plans arising from the plan will be developed in the future and brought to Council.

Vice-chair Michelmann invited the acting dean of the College of Medicine, Lou Qualtiere, and vice-provost, College of Medicine organizational restructuring, Martin Phillipson, to provide comments. Mr. Phillipson provided an oral presentation to Council. He explained the extensive consultation process utilized to develop the plan, which included numerous meetings of the dean's advisory committee and the working groups, and a number of town halls prior to the development of the plan and after the release of the draft plan. He advised that *The Way Forward* document speaks to how to address the key issues of accreditation, student outcomes on national exams, and research underperformance. These are the symptoms of the problems at the College of Medicine. The cause is the underlying structures of the college, which have resulted in the misalignment of resources and priorities. Mr. Phillipson stressed that the College of Medicine needs to be reformed as it is being asked to do different things than when it was first established. There is a need to realign time and resources dedicated to teaching, research and clinical services. This is not a question of resources as the college has been well-funded and has renewed infrastructure to do leading research.

Mr. Phillipson advised that the process has been difficult at times, and there is a need for further consultation, which may be controversial. However, the status quo is not acceptable, and therefore the college must proceed. This document sets out the start of the 'how' to solve the issues. There is a need to realign with our teaching and research missions looking at the following three areas: realign faculty complement; re-conceptualize research; restructure college governance and partnerships. Mr. Phillipson spoke to the issues in each of these areas and the progress to date.

Regarding accreditation, one of the main problems is that the college and the university have failed to deal with accountability of full-time faculty and the authority of the dean. There is a need to design a different governance structure with a more diffused power structure. A positive sign is that much progress has been made over the last few months regarding the assignment of duties of the college's full-time clinical faculty members.

Regarding the faculty complement, the medical faculty represents a unique category of university appointments as they do not fit the model of the majority of academic appointments on campus, due to their delivery of clinical services and limited capacity to perform teaching and service. As a result, the college intends to formalize its relationship with community-based clinical part-time faculty members, who teach to undergraduates, and provide these members with a greater say regarding the college's curriculum. The plan proposes to recruit clinical educators and clinician scientists. The university has requested \$10 M from the provincial government to assist in the recruitment of highly successful clinician scientists to build the college's research outputs. There is a need to increase the college's research intensiveness and identify research priorities via the college's *Towards 2020* research plan. The college must align its research priorities with provincial imperatives and existing research strengths on campus. This is an ongoing process. There is a need to balance the compensation system so research is valued at the same level as teaching and clinical services, and discussions are underway with the province regarding a new clinical compensation model.

The plan introduces the concept of three vice-deans with the authority to address education, research and faculty engagement, thereby reinforcing accountability and providing a leadership model which will reduce the number of direct reports to the dean. The college is committed to the unified headship model which will be a focal point for distributed medical education to ensure quality academic programming is produced by the college across the province. The biomedical sciences require reconfiguration as these five departments have 90% of their teaching outside the College of Medicine. In comparison to key peers, the biomedical sciences departments are achieving 50% of the CIHR funding. Therefore, there is a need to rationalize programming and improve the research performance of these departments in support of the College of Medicine. The faculty members within the biomedical sciences have acknowledged that there is a need for change, but have indicated additional consultation is needed. Therefore, the current acting dean, incoming acting dean and Mr. Phillipson will form a task force to meet with the biomedical sciences departments within the next two weeks to set out a process and timeline for discussion to involve faculty from these departments in the redesign of their departments.

Mr. Phillipson advised that the university continues to be open with the government and health regions regarding the changes necessary to ensure that clinicians have protected time for teaching and research. The health regions in Saskatoon and Regina are lined up to partner with the college and have acknowledged that the College of Medicine is a fundamental part of the provision of provincial health care services.

Mr. Phillipson advised that any proposal to reconfigure the biomedical sciences and any changes to their associated academic programs will be submitted to Council, and that this process will take 12-18 months and will include consultation with the College of Arts and Science.

Questions and comments were invited from Council. A Council member noted that the College of Medicine has been focused on the preparation of future physicians and not on the preparation of future biomedical scientists. He questioned who has the responsibility to develop biomedical scientists, and noted that this question requires further consideration between the College of Arts and Science and the College of Medicine regarding the College of Medicine's present mandate for its faculty members to teach students enrolled in the college's M.D. undergraduate program and students enrolled in the biomedical sciences.

A Council member commented on the mechanism and principles referred to in the report to increase research intensiveness and decrease administration and teaching loads of faculty. He noted that this is being done from the principle that there is limited time available for people to realign these goals. He noted that the focus on being research intensive affects teaching. He also noted that the performance of undergraduate students on national exams being low in comparison to other medical schools is due to the curriculum being outdated and directing students' activity to areas not in line with the exam questions. This is a problem with the curriculum and not a problem with the college's admissions process or student ability. Next month Council will be introduced to a new curriculum for the college's undergraduate program to be introduced in August 2014, which makes significant steps in the right direction.

A Council member noted that he was unclear about the changes to the clinical educator model that will address the problems we have identified and questioned how the accrediting body will view keeping the unified heads that tie the Saskatoon Health Region with the College of Medicine. Mr. Phillipson advised that there will be twenty faculty that will spend most of their time as professional educators and that we need to make the College of Medicine and

the clinical environment mutually supportive and balanced. A significantly enhanced job profile has been developed for the unified heads and we have to meet with government and the health regions to make that work.

Dr. Bill Roesler, head of the biochemistry department, provided comments to Council noting that the five biomedical science faculties are not against change and realize the status quo is not sustainable in light of the last few years, due to not being able to re-hire retirements and hiring based on research rather than discipline needs for teaching. However, Dr. Roesler noted he did not agree with the recommendations of the working group and noted further that the composition of the working group included only one member of the biomedical sciences departments. Although there was ample opportunity for consultation and input, the original proposal varies little from the final recommendations of the group, illustrating that the working group was able to elicit very little change. Regarding the final structure of one unified department or unit, within the medical schools across Canada, there is no one consistent model and Dr. Roesler noted that there are a variety of successful models. While the chasm between the biomedical science departments and the College of Medicine may seem wide at this time, he indicated that in his view these groups were not that far apart. The five department heads have met as a group to discuss the parameters of the proposed task force and contacted the in-coming acting dean to indicate they would like to meet with him as soon as he is in his new position. Dr. Roesler indicated that the biomedical science department heads realize they must proceed expeditiously and embrace change.

Dr. Benjamin Rosser, head of the Anatomy and Cell Biology Department, agreed with Dr. Roesler, advising that the biomedical science faculty members are not obstructionists and do understand the need for change and to move forward. However, faculty in these departments do not feel they have been part of the process and the development of the implementation plan, which suggests that the faculty complement in the biomedical sciences division be reduced to 60 faculty members from 78 faculty members, and from five departments to two departments. Dr. Rosser read the motion from the College of Medicine Faculty Council; “that the College of Medicine form a task force with meaningful and significant representation from the five basic science departments within the Division of Biomedical Sciences to review and revise the recommendations for the reorganization of these departments and their program offerings.” He noted that this motion was passed at the College of Medicine Faculty Council and the formation of a task force is a very positive step forward.

Mr. Phillipson agreed that there is a need to work together to find an optimal structure. Part of the purpose of the implementation plan was to provoke key discussions. Although some of the discussions have been fractious, the goal is to have the right discussions and come to the right conclusions. He noted that he is happy to work with the biomedical science departments and believes in pushing together in the right direction to achieve desired results. In order for this to occur, the college must work across the entire collegium within the college.

9. Academic Programs Committee

Dr. Jay Kalra resumed the role of chair. Dr. Roy Dobson, chair of the academic programs committee, presented the academic programs committee report to Council.

9.1 Request for Information: Resolution of Challenge

Dr. Dobson advised that a course challenge was submitted by the College of Arts and Science regarding the college’s science requirement. The change was challenged by the

division of science primarily on the definition of what is a science requirement. This led to extensive discussion that spanned four committee meetings. The resolution was to allow two philosophy classes to be listed as needing the science distribution requirement in the bachelor of arts programs in the humanities and fine arts provided that the label of the requirement is changed to reflect the nature of the range of classes available to students in this category, such as “science, mathematics or logic”. In view of the difficulty regarding the resolution of this issue, the committee has strongly recommended that the College of Arts and Science review its bylaws on how inter-curricular matters are reviewed. Peter Stoicheff, the dean of the College of Arts and Science thanked the committee for its resolution and advised that the review of the college’s bylaws will be addressed at the faculty council meeting in February.

10. Nominations Committee

Dr. Ed Krol, chair of the nominations committee, presented the report.

10.1 Request for decision: Nominations to the Review Committee for the Vice-president Research

Ed Krol described the process followed to identify the individuals proposed for the review committee. The chair called for nominations from the floor three times.

KROL/DOBSON: That Council approve the following nominations to the Review Committee for the Vice-president Research:

Four GAA members: Marie Battiste (Educational Foundations), Oleg Dmitriev (Biochemistry), Rob Scott (Chemistry), Charlene Sorensen (University Library)

One member of Council who holds a senior administrative position: David Parkinson, vice-dean, College of Arts and Science

CARRIED

11. Governance Committee

Roy Dobson, member of the governance committee presented this item to Council as Dean Carol Rodgers, chair of the governance committee was unable to attend.

11.1 Request for Decision: Nomination to the Nominations Committee

The chair called for nominations three times from the floor.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the nomination of Keith Walker to the Nominations Committee for a one-year term ending June 30, 2014.

CARRIED

12. Other business

There was no other business.

13. Question period

There were no other questions.

14. Adjournment

DESBRISAY/DOBSON: That the meeting be adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

CARRIED

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, November 21, 2013