

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Adoption of the agenda

PHOENIX/KALYNCHUK: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra, chair of Council, provided opening remarks and explained the meeting procedures. He noted the conflict of interest provisions in Council's bylaws and that all members of Council are obligated to comply with the provisions and act in the best interest of the University by declaring any conflicts of interest.

The chair welcomed Dr. Ernie Barber as the incoming interim provost and vice-president academic and invited him to provide comments. Dr. Barber noted that he believes in the University of Saskatchewan and its mission of learning and supporting students as well as its mission of a university for research, scholarly and artistic work. He noted he admires the university for its commitment to community engagement, locally and globally, as this underpins and gives meaning to its teaching and research. He advised that he feels saddened by the dissidence experienced by the university, but feels that everyone does care deeply about the institution and is passionate about the university and what it stands for. Dr. Barber advised that he begins in July and that over the summer he will read and listen so that by the fall he will be in a position to speak to the work of the university. Having the right leadership in place for change initiatives is critical, and Dr. Barber advised he would put great energy into listening and learning for the sake of the university. He thanked Dr. Brett Fairbairn, former provost and vice-president academic, for his service, as well as his offer of assistance to him as he takes on his new role. He also thanked President Barnhart for the confidence he has shown in him. Dr. Barber closed noting the importance of a relationship of mutual trust and respect with all university leaders, and all on University Council; and he offered his commitment to work together, and to work diligently for the good of the university's academic work and mission.

3. Minutes of the meeting of May 22, 2014

A correction was noted to the minutes regarding the tribute to Duff Spafford, as he was in the Department of Political Studies, not the Department of History.

MICHELMANN/WOTHERSPOON: That the Council minutes of May 22, 2014 be approved as amended.

CARRIED

#### 4. Business from the minutes

Professor James Brooke noted that the notice of motion that he had submitted to the coordinating committee, which was seconded by Professor William Bartley, would not be on the agenda, and that it had been referred to both the governance and planning and priorities committees for their deliberation and to provide a report to Council. He requested that as these two committees will consider the motions, that it would be fair for Council members to be shown the motion and asked that the notice of motion be entered into the minutes. The university secretary conferred with the chair and then communicated to Council that there is an expectation that the committees will include the motion with their report and that adding it to these minutes would imply that this body discussed the motion, which in fact is not the situation.

After further comments from Professor Brooke, the chair advised that the motion had been considered by the coordinating committee and an appropriate response sent to the mover and seconder, and that subsequent questions asked by the mover and seconder have been clarified directly with them. Council received confirmation that both committees would consider the motion and report back to Council.

Professor Kathleen Solose advised that she also provided a notice of motion to the coordinating committee and believed that as the powers of Council are to review the budgetary plans and make recommendations to the president, she thought it odd that the notice of motion did not come first to Council and then be forwarded to Council committees for consideration.

A Council member noted that at the last Council meeting the question of solidarity of executive members on Council was raised. He noted that Professor Brooke sent a comment to the governance committee and that comments may not have addressed Professor Brooke's issue sufficiently. The chair replied that the letter from Professor Brooke was sent to the Board of Governors as well as the governance committee of Council, and the governance committee has responded directly to Professor Brooke.

#### 5. Report of the President

President Gordon Barnhart reported on his recent activities. He advised that he was enjoying serving the university community and that the last month had been an interesting challenge with many meetings and he appreciated the feedback he was receiving. He expressed he was delighted that Dr. Barber would be the interim provost and vice-president academic, and that he looked forward to working closely with him.

Dr. Barnhart informed Council that before he became president he was working on three contracts and he can now advise that he has resigned from all three contracts. He also disclosed to Council that he was on the National History Board, his condominium board, and Rotary, and did not believe his membership on any of these boards and organizations formed a conflict of interest with the university.

President Barnhart advised that the practice of escorting employees off campus following termination of their employment has been revoked. With the support of the Board of Governors, the university commits to treating everyone with dignity and respect, whether working here or leaving here. This statement was met by applause.

President Barnhart advised it was wonderful to meet so many members of the university community and hear comments both for and against particular issues. Regarding refocusing the university from an academic view and with regard to financial sustainability, senior administration

will take July and August to carefully and thoroughly review all of the processes taking place and take the time necessary to make sure any decisions preceding will be taken with care. President Barnhart stated that the university would not go back to square one and start over as hundreds of hours have gone into discussing why we are here and that should not be thrown aside. Also, there is concern about the accreditation of the College of Medicine, and other similar projects have to continue because they are vital to the university and preceded TransformUS. He assured Council there would be more discussion of these matters in the fall, and Council would be involved in the decisions.

Regarding DefendUS, President Barnhart advised that he was given a deadline from DefendUS for a meeting by June 6<sup>th</sup> which was during Convocation week. He responded and offered to meet with a small group from DefendUS on June 13 to hear members' views on what constitutes meaningful consultation; however, as this date was too soon for some members, a date to meet has been set at the end of next week.

President Barnhart noted his recent opportunity to speak with the Rotary club about all of the good things the university is doing and will be doing and indicated he would be involved with the U15 and the AUCC. He assured Council that the word is getting out that the university is alive and well and its reputation is strong and will be stronger.

The president then invited Greg Fowler, vice-president finance and resources, to speak on financial sustainability. Mr. Fowler provided a PowerPoint presentation which is attached as Appendix B. He noted that there would be a fuller presentation in the fall but that he was providing the information at present as an update. Like other universities across Canada, the university's expenses are growing at a faster rate than its revenues. The university's base expenses are growing at 4% whereas its revenues are growing at 2%.

Mr. Fowler illustrated the change in government funding over the past five years and what is expected for the next two years, showing that in 2011/12 the university received a government funding increase of 5.4% and that in 2012/13 it received an increase of 2%. He advised that it was identified that there would be a \$44.5M deficit on an annual basis by 2016. The actions taken since 2012 have assured that the university has balanced the budget annually and there have been no deficits to date. Mr. Fowler advised that there have been various budget adjustments over the past 20 years and the goal is to be in a position where tuition is kept at an affordable rate of growth, faculty and staff are kept together, and the university is able to move forward without budget cuts every four to five years.

Mr. Fowler compared the university's situation to that of universities across the nation and advised that the University of Saskatchewan is one of the best-funded institutions in Canada and continues to be supported by the province. Given the demands of healthcare within the province and how other universities are affected across the nation, he recommending continuing with realistic funding requests of the province in the area of 2%. Mr. Fowler also noted that RBC has lowered its expectation of growth in Saskatchewan, and that he would be monitoring this change closely to determine its impact on university funding.

Mr. Fowler reported that by last spring \$15.5M in savings had been achieved and over the past year \$16.5M in combined reduced expenses and increased revenues was attained based partially on the faculty retirement incentive plan. These savings account for \$32M in permanent budget adjustments achieved against the original target of \$44.5M. Mr. Fowler illustrated the progress against the original target showing \$8M from changes in institutional practice, \$6.6M in changes in investment strategy, \$7.6M through the net faculty incentive plan for retirement (gross savings of \$12.4M in 2015/16), and \$9.8M from workforce planning.

Mr. Fowler reminded Council that the program prioritization over the past two years was not just about savings but also about renewing the university to assist in meeting its budgetary needs through the opportunity to make lasting changes, informed by TABBS, as a new budget model. Areas signaled for investment included funding for faculty; program enhancements; classroom technology; and student supports, with further priorities to be identified through consultation.

Mr. Fowler noted there is still work to do and the multi-year budget will be updated for the fall. Looking past 2017, the university needs to find a way for its ] expenses to be in line with its revenues. Mr. Fowler informed Council that he would return in the fall to speak of the financial results for the year.

The president and Mr. Fowler then received questions. A Council member noted that at the previous Council meeting he had brought to the president's attention a matter raised by a student in the School of Public Health who stated that there was a serious culture of fear and intimidation in the school and asked whether it had been investigated and a report created. President Barnhart advised that last week he had met with interim executive director Martin Phillipson and six or seven of the graduate students including Izabela Vlahu, president of the GSA. He indicated that these issues and others were raised at that meeting and there will be continuing dialogue, but that he was confident that many of the issues could be resolved in the near future.

A Council member noted a concern for the state of tenure when hiring administrators external to the university. To provide context, he noted that the former president's employment contract outlined the terms for a tenured position in the Department of Mechanical Engineering and his interpretation was that she did not hold tenure in the department at the time when she was president but she would be provided with tenure when she completed her term or was terminated without cause. However, he assumed that she would not receive a position of tenure if terminated with cause or if she resigned. (He noted that this would not apply to internally hired administrators as the USFA ensures tenure to in-scope faculty members who take administrative positions). The Council member noted that this raises the concept of contingent tenure rather than real tenure, and breaks the concept of tenure if offered conditionally. He noted that the former provost said a leader cannot lead and oppose the university at the same time, and therefore if the leader cannot carry out that role the only option is to resign and he agreed with that; however, if there is contingent tenure, then the administrator is not in the same position. He asked whether this question of contingent tenure was the decision of university management or the Board of Governors, and will the university administration act to offer a real form of tenure to externally hired administrators.

Vice-provost Jim Germida, advised that Article 15 of the collective agreement with the USFA speaks to the hiring of an individual out-of-scope and that if they are to return to an in-scope position then they are to follow the tenure processes in the agreement. He explained that when an individual is hired to an out-of-scope position, the unit proposed as the unit in which tenure will be held is asked if tenure will be recommended – which was done for the former president. Their appointment is with tenure, if the tenure appointment committee recommends it.

Dean Daphne Taras of the Edwards School of Business advised that she was one of the external deans hired in a similar appointment contract and she would urge the university to clarify within each individual employment contract, such that upon removal from the contract the administrator simultaneously enters into their tenured position. She requested immediate amendment to these contracts and suggested that this would assist in remedying the reputation of the university.

A Council member advised that there have been three rounds of program reviews including curriculum mapping in which faculty were told to justify their programs by creating goals and

evaluating these programs via the collegial process. She estimated spending about 200 hours of her own time on this as program chair, in addition to the time spent by other faculty members and the time of students completing student questionnaires. The curriculum reports were submitted and then faculty were told that the reports were not needed as the TransformUS process would be conducted. Countless hours were then invested in TransformUS, as the second round of program review. Upon the suspension of TransformUS, faculty members have once again been asked to undergo a curriculum review—comprising the third round of assessment. The Council member asked that faculty be left alone to do research and teaching.

Two non-Council faculty asked if they could ask questions to which the chair suggested that they be brought during the question period so that the other business of the meeting could be done given the many agenda items and time constraints.

## 6. Report from the Provost's Office

The chair noted that the former provost's report had been circulated. There were no questions.

## 7. Student Societies

### 7.1 Report from the GSA

Xin Lu, vice-president operations and communications of the Graduate Students' Association (GSA), presented the report to Council on behalf of the President of the GSA who could not be in attendance. She advised that on June 2 the GSA held a special general meeting of the membership which included a vote of non-confidence in the program prioritization known as TransformUS. The concerns raised included: questionable validity of deficit used and the budget crisis; the lack of transparency and consultation (including discussion of the document entitled, "Silence of the Deans"); detrimental effects of TransformUS and the reputation of the university which jeopardizes the degrees earned by all students; elimination or starvation of academic programs – many small, elite or inexpensive; and closing of four out of seven libraries being an obstacle to research and learning.

Ms. Lu noted that some students felt uncomfortable with this vote and the public announcement as they were concerned such a vote would result in the GSA's isolation regarding any further discussion of TransformUS and that the vote would deteriorate the relationship of graduate students with senior administration.

She advised that knowing the student voice is highly valued, the GSA executive is pleased that the majority of students felt comfortable adopting a motion which provided necessary criticism to improve the university. The vote is viewed by the GSA executive as a vote of non-confidence in the senior administration. Ms. Lu was hopeful that the interim president will be able to show graduate students that they study at a university where freedom of speech is valued and their education is supported and she believed this was key to the university having a bright future.

The chair thanked Ms. Lu. With the chair's permission, one question was allowed. A Council member asked Ms. Lu to inform Council of the number of students who participated in the GSA vote and what the vote count was. Ms. Lu reported that quorum was reached for the special general meeting and that she could check the minutes for the number of students that voted for and against the motion and report back to Council.

## 8. Planning and priorities committee

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

### 8.1 Report for information: Annual report

Dr. Walley drew Council's attention to the report in the written meeting materials advising that it lists those items that the planning and priorities committee addressed through the year. She thanked the committee members for their hard work throughout the year and also thanked the resource personnel who provided support, especially Sandra Calver for her support to the committee and the chair.

### 8.2 Report for information: Report on Capital Planning

Dr. Walley advised that the report provides information about the committee's discussions on capital planning throughout the year. In the past, the committee has not reported regularly to Council on capital planning, and therefore the committee decided to initiate an annual report on capital planning. There will be a second report on the university's Annual Capital Plan that will go to Council for information in September.

A Council member noted that in the report there was a discussion regarding using endowment lands to reduce the deficit and asked whether the committee had made any recommendations about developing the lands in order to reduce the deficit, or whether Council could expect recommendations to come forth as a result of the committee's consultations. Dr. Walley explained that there was a lot of discussion at the committee to understand the extent of the university's endowment lands both in and outside of the city. However, the committee's discussion was in response to a presentation and was primarily information gathering and that no specific recommendations have been made. She invited Mr. Fowler to provide more information regarding the future use of the lands.

Mr. Fowler advised that in the past there was a highly consultative process which resulted in the Vison 2057 document. The university has approximately 1000 acres of endowment lands including research lands and lands adjacent to the core campus. The research lands will not be developed, but the university has begun some land development over the past ten years through the Preston Crossing regional development, which is now moving into phases four and five. The university has also been working with the city, Board of Governors and other authorities to determine how best to develop its other lands. This year is a planning year to look at what other universities have done and consult with others, including with members of Simon Fraser University and Guelph University who will attend the next Board meeting to advise on how these institutions have developed their university lands. Mr. Fowler advised that it is a long process but that in long term, endowment lands can be used to support the university's core mission.

Dr. Walley noted that the committee wanted to understand how the land base could figure into budgetary planning and future planning, which was part of the impetus for more regular communications to Council.

The chair thanked Dr. Walley for her leadership of the planning and priorities committee over the past year.

9. Academic programs committee

Professor Roy Dobson, chair of the APC presented the reports to Council.

9.1 Request for decision: College of Arts and Science – Three-year, four-year and Honours Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science programs in Geography

Professor Dobson highlighted that a large number of programs are offered in Geography and emphasized the teaching in various areas. The department is trying to simplify its course offerings, and the programs recommended for elimination either overlap with other similar programs, or are deemed less rigorous. He advised that termination of these programs should have no impact on students seeking graduate work in the field.

A Council member asked whether ceasing to use the term “Geography” would dissuade students from coming to the university. Dr. Dobson advised that the title of the Department of Geography is being retained and there has been assurance that no paths will be eliminated. The courses will retain the label “Geography” so students will be able to find them online.

A Council member asked whether the change was connected to TransformUS. Alexis Dahl, director of the Programs Office in the College of Arts and Science, informed Council that the Department of Geography and Planning is currently the home of four undergraduate programs, as well as Master of Arts, Master of Science and Ph.D. programs. The distinction among programs was not enough to justify supporting all of them. This decision was taken by the department prior to the beginning of the program prioritization and communicated in their TransformUS templates.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the termination of the three-year, four-year and Honours Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science programs in Geography, effective September 2014.

CARRIED

9.2 Request for decision: College of Arts and Science - Certificate of Proficiency in Aboriginal Theatre

Dr. Dobson noted that this is a new two-year program that will be offered by the Department of Drama. Students completing the program have the ability to move into a three or four-year degree, such as a Bachelor of Fine Arts.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the Certificate of Proficiency in Aboriginal Theatre, effective September 2015.

CARRIED

9.3 Request for decision: College of Graduate Studies and Research - Master of Science in Marketing

Professor Dobson indicated that the new M.Sc. in Marketing is a revitalization of programming in this area, and that a former program was discontinued due to a lack of faculty resources. Professor Dobson reported that if Council approves adding this program classes would begin in September 2015 operating under a special tuition model, beyond the normal range of other programs at the university. Upon Council’s approval of the program, approval of the tuition associated with the program will be sought from the Board of Governors.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the Master of Science in Marketing, with the first cohort beginning classes September 2015.

CARRIED

9.4 Request for decision: College of Graduate Studies and Research - Master of Physical Therapy – change to admission qualifications

Professor Dobson advised that the proposed admission qualification change relates to language proficiency. The current requirement is a total score is 80, which is seen as insufficient for the Master of Physical Therapy. The requested change is a minimum total score of 100, which is in line with similar professional programs within the university and in other universities.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the changes in admission qualifications for the Master of Physical Therapy, effective September 2015.

CARRIED

9.5 Request for input: Proposed Academic Courses Policy revisions

Professor Dobson noted the report is a request for input on the proposed changes to the Academic Courses policy. The proposed changes largely originate from the Associate Deans' group on student issues and from input from students, staff and faculty received since the last revision to the policy. He noted that the policy was revised quite recently. He asked that comments be forwarded to Alex Beldan in the University Secretary's office by September 1, 2014. Jim Greer, a committee member, added that this is an important and complex set of regulations and urged members of Council to review the materials and provide feedback as the policy has implications for teaching and examinations.

9.6 Report for information: Arts and Science – Termination of Minors in Human and Physical Geography; Arts and Science - Bachelors of Music in Music Education – Adding Honours Depth of Study

Professor Dobson advised that this information relates to two items approved at the committee level: the termination of Minors in Human and Physical Geography in the College of Arts and Science; and the adding of the honours depth of study in the Bachelors of Music in Music Education. He noted that the committee found the rationale for the proposals to be adequate and therefore approved these two actions.

9.7 Report for information: Annual Report

Professor Dobson drew Council's attention to the committee's annual report and expressed his pleasure and honour to be chair. He thanked those on the committee for their hard work and acknowledged the work of members on various subcommittees. He also thanked Patti MacDougall, Pauline Melis, Jacquie Thomarat, Jason Doell and the SESD staff for their contributions and Cathie Fornssler, former committee secretary, for all she had done for the committee and the university.

9.8 Request for input: Proposed Recommendations on Program Evaluation and Approval Processes

Professor Dobson advised that the committee is seeking input on the process for program evaluation and approval. The proposed changes were developed by the planning



subcommittee of the academic programs committee (APC), which was established to review criteria for program evaluation and approval used by APC. Professor Dobson explained the impetus to review APC's program approval process arose from the TransformUS process in anticipation of close scrutiny of any program recommendations arising from TransformUS. The subcommittee sought to clarify the process and rules on which program decisions are based.

In reviewing the criteria, the subcommittee looked at a variety of sources already approved by Council with the end result that the subcommittee was satisfied that no new criteria were required. The existing criteria were pulled into a coherent worksheet provided in the written materials. Professor Dobson invited Council members to review the materials and provide comments so the committee can ensure when it adds or deletes programs that there is a clear set of criteria being used that is understood. He invited comments to be emailed to [alex.beldan@usask.ca](mailto:alex.beldan@usask.ca), [roy.dobson@usask.ca](mailto:roy.dobson@usask.ca), or [university.secretary@usask.ca](mailto:university.secretary@usask.ca).

## 10. Governance Committee

Professor Louise Racine, member of the governance committee, presented the reports to Council on behalf of Carol Rodgers, chair.

### 10.1 Request for decision: Council bylaws amendments

Professor Racine noted the item was presented at the last Council meeting as a notice of motion. The request is to align current practices to those stated in *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995* by permitting the university secretary to name a member of her office to act as secretary to Council on her behalf; to delete a provision on process at convocation to align with current practices; and housekeeping changes to numbering discrepancies.

RACINE/DOBSON: That Council approve the following amendments to Council Bylaws:

1. Addition of the following statement as Part One, III, 5 (k) "Unless the Council decides otherwise, the secretary of Council meetings shall be the University Secretary, or a member of the University Secretary's office as designated by the University Secretary."
2. Deletion of the following two sentences from Part Three, I, 2 - "Recipients of degrees other than honorary degrees shall be presented for admission by the dean of the faculty, or a designate, to which the degree belongs. Each recipient of an honorary degree shall be presented for admission by the President or by a person designated for that purpose by the President."
3. Housekeeping changes to correct cross-referencing in Part One, III, 5 (f) and (g), as shown on the attached pages 5 and 6 of Council Bylaws.

CARRIED

### 10.2 Request for decision: Amendment to *Procedures for Student Appeals in Academic Matters*

Professor Racine noted the recommended amendment. A Council member asked about the proposed amendment and whether it favoured the student. The university secretary advised that the concern is that if a student has been asked to withdraw from a program or there is a request to discontinue, the school or college has the ability to modify the clinical requirements or practicum requirements so that the student would not have direct contact

with a client, patient or student, so the change is seen as being in favour of clients, patients, or similar members of the public.

RACINE/DOBSON: That Council approve the amendment to the Procedures on Student Appeals in Academic Matters to enable the university to modify a student's involvement in a practicum, clinical setting, or other work environment when the student has appealed a decision of academic assessment related to the student's work and interactions with others in these types of settings.

CARRIED

Professor Racine thanked Dr. Carol Rodgers for her dedicated work and leadership as committee chair. She also thanked members of the committee and the support from Sandra Calver, Sheena Rowan, and Lesley Leonhardt throughout the year.

## 11. Nominations committee

### 11.1 Request for decision: Nominations: Academic Programs Committee; Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee

Professor Terry Wotherspoon, vice-chair of the nominations committee, presented this report to Council.

Professor Wotherspoon noted a follow-up from the member roster put forward in May. The membership terms of Roy Dobson, chair of academic programs committee, and Lisa Kalynchuk, chair of the planning and priorities committee, are three-year terms concluding June 30, 2017.

The vacancies on academic programs committee and teaching, learning and academic resources committee occurred for various reasons, including a sabbatical leave and move between committees resulting in the motion put forward.

The chair of Council called for nominations from the floor three times. There were no nominations made from the floor.

WOTHERSPOON/DAUM SHANKS: That Council approve the nominations of Matthew Paige, Department of Chemistry and Ganesh Vaidyanathan, Department of Accounting to the Academic Programs Committee and Takuji Tanaka, Department of Food and Bioproduct Sciences to the Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee, for three-year terms respectively ending June 30, 2017.

CARRIED

Professor Wotherspoon acknowledged the work and commitment of the committee members and the chair, Ed Krol, and thanked Cathie Fornssler and Sandy Calver for their support.

## 12. Coordinating committee

### 12.1 Motion from Individual Council member: Motion to rescind approval of document Vision 2025: From Spirit to Action

The chair noted that it is unusual for Council to be asked to consider a motion brought by an individual member of Council, as most motions come to Council through its committees. However, Council does have a provision in its bylaws for the coordinating committee to

consider motions from individual Council members and either include them on Council's agenda or refer the matter to a standing committee which will then report back on the matter to the coordinating committee of Council. The chair advised that in keeping with the bylaws, the coordinating committee has considered the request and decided the individual member's motion should be brought directly to Council. The chair then set out the process to be followed for debate and invited Professor John Rigby, mover of the motion, to speak to the motion.

Professor Rigby explained to Council why he thought the Vision 2025 document was important and also why he thought Council should reconsider the approval of the document. He noted that Vision 2025 was an initiative championed by former president Ilene Busch-Vishniac and reflects her understanding of the important vision of the university. Given that Dr. Busch-Vishniac's employment terminated without cause shortly after the Vision 2025 document was approved he noted that it may not reflect views of future leadership.

The following motion was made and seconded:

RIGBY/KALYNCHUK: That Council rescind the motion moved by Dr. Walley and seconded by Dr. Kalynchuk of April 17, 2014 approving the document Vision 2025: From Spirit to Action as the new institutional vision document of the University of Saskatchewan.

A Council member commented that it felt odd to rescind a motion that was passed by Council especially if it is not with the spirit that it was a bad document and the direction needs to change. He noted that a vision document can be 'spawned' whenever a president wishes to 'spawn' one, but with this document he did not think it bound the university to a set of priorities, nor that it points in a direction that is inappropriate at this time. He advised that he does not want to give the impression that by rescinding the document, Council disagrees with its statements as it includes language and an approach for issues surrounding the university's Aboriginal initiative that are very positive, and he did not want to see them put on hold for some time due to the document's rescission. For these reasons he advised that he felt uncomfortable rescinding the motion.

Another Council member encouraged the interim president to consider the vision statement and whether he wished to revisit it. She noted that she has concerns about the process that was followed in drafting the vision document as she understood that it did not go to colleges prior to approval by Council. She recommended that the appropriate procedure would be to invite President Barnhart to consider the document.

Another Council member noted that he was concerned that rescinding the document would compromise elements in the vision statement that the university would regret. He noted he was personally heartened by the comments in the document about Aboriginal engagement and asked whether the movers and seconders of the motion would assure that by rescinding the vision document, Council would not be rescinding its commitment to Aboriginal engagement.

Professor Rigby replied that he was not sure if it was for him to respond to this request. He did not think the issue was the content of the vision statement but rather that there is on record a vision statement that was championed by a president who ceased to be president of the university four weeks later. He indicated that although he voted in favour of the document when presented to Council he felt that at this time, the university would be doing a disservice to a new president by locking them into this vision document.

A Council member noted that he understood the impulse to go in this direction and that it was a good time to discuss the issue, but that he did not agree that the document should be referred to as the former president's vision statement. He advised that the vision document had received much input, including input from two Senate meetings. He confirmed that the deans were asked to distribute the statement to their colleges and seek feedback but was not sure if this occurred in all of the colleges. His concern was that if Council rescinds its approval of the vision document, it will appear as though Council does not support the document and the important goals it sets out. He expressed his view of the Vision 2025 document as being transformative and aspirational.

A Council member likened the vision document to a delusion advocated by a former country. She recommended that instead of obliging the new administration to follow the old administration's vision, the new administration should bring forward a new vision that will reflect the faculty, administration and students and be truly unifying. She believed by rescinding this document it would not affect the Aboriginal engagement development at the university, which is a theme she believed would clearly emerge in a new vision document. She encouraged the assembly to delegate work on a new vision document to the new administration.

A Council member noted that she was very uncomfortable with a motion to rescind Council's approval, partly because Council did not rescind former president Peter MacKinnon's vision when he left. She noted that she wanted to respect the input that was gathered from so many people in the development of the document and although it might have come initially from former president Busch-Vishniac's desk, the document was developed on the shoulders of others that have contributed to it. The Council member recommended a friendly amendment to the rescission motion to keep the discussion of Aboriginal engagement. She concluded that there is a concern about the prescriptive nature of this document and therefore understood its rescission but was also afraid of losing the important Aboriginal engagement comments.

A Council member spoke in support of the rescission motion noting that she cannot see why parts could not be included in a future document. She advised that there are some parts of the document that are problematic that correspond with Dr. Busch-Vishniac's vision of the university. Based on consideration of the re-evaluation of TransformUS, the Council member recommended against being bound by the document for the next ten years.

A Council member stated that she did not want to rescind the motion approving the vision document. She advised that the document was created by a community and that Council debated the document and voted in favour of the document rather than in favour of the author. She advised that the document reflects the input of many individuals who chose to participate and that in her opinion, there was much consultation in creating the document.

A former Council member noted her objection with the vision document was about the fact the Mission no longer stated that we are the people's university and she believed that there had not been enough discussion about what the university would be. She advised that people are unhappy with this and she supported the motion to rescind the vision document, believing it to be fatally flawed based upon the new Mission statement that it contains.

The seconder of the motion agreed with her fellow Council members who spoke in favour of the vision document. She advised that based upon the discussion she has heard she no longer supports the motion, and that her initial concern was that of the vision document tying the hands of a future president.

A Council member noted that he was originally going to support the rescission motion to give free reign to the new president, but in listening to the discussion he advised that he did not want to confuse the message. He noted that any document produced would be flawed in some fashion, but did not see any reason why a future president could not make modifications. Therefore, the new president's hands are not tied. In his opinion the university should look at the vision document constantly and seek to modify it as the university evolves. Therefore, he advised that he will vote against the rescission motion. Another Council member noted her agreement with these comments emphasizing that even if the vision document has been approved it does not stop Council from seeing a revised version and approving a revised version in the future.

A Council member asked for confirmation as to whether the vision document could be amended noting that when it was approved she believed it was said at that time the vision document could not be amended. The university secretary confirmed that the vision document could be amended in the future.

The university secretary also advised Council that the Board of Governors have not approved the vision document because prior to its Board meeting Council's motion to rescind the document had been suggested and when this was communicated to the Board they decided they would defer considering approval of the document until Council had determined whether they would rescind it or not.

A Council member advised that at the meeting when the vision document was approved by Council he had asked whether the document was amendable and the answer received was that it was, and he emphasized that Council should understand that the vision document can be amended in the future. For these reasons, he advised that he intends to vote against the motion to rescind the document. Another Council member clarified that when the document came to Council initially for approval it was made clear to Council that the president could not amend the document without Council's approval.

A Council member recommended that in the spirit of the discussion a friendly amendment be made to the rescission motion to not rescind approval of the vision document but to revisit the document with possible amendments, or to request the interim president facilitate the process for amendment. The university secretary advised that a motion to rescind is not amendable and therefore according to our rules of procedure this cannot be done; however, it would be possible to bring an alternate motion to introduce this second concept.

A former Council member asked for clarification as to whether it was the intent of Council to replace the mission statement. The university secretary advised that if the Vision 2025 document was not rescinded by Council and received approval by the Board of Governors it would become a university-wide statement including the new mission statement, as it already has Senate approval.

There was a call for confirmation that quorum still existed. It was confirmed by counting the number of Council members in attendance that quorum has been maintained.

PARKINSON/GREER: Move to postpone the motion to rescind the former Council motion approving the Vision 2025 document until the next meeting of Council.

CARRIED

The university secretary advised that the motion to rescind Council's former approval of the Vision 2025 document will come back to the next Council meeting in September.

13. Research, scholarly and artistic work committee

Professor Julita Vassileva provided the reports to Council on behalf of the chair of the research, scholarly and artistic work committee.

13.1 Report for information: Annual report

Professor Vassileva provided highlights of the RSAW annual report noting that the committee had 18 regular meetings during the academic year. Since the committee's mid-year report to Council in January, the committee has focused on writing and finalizing the Undergraduate Research Initiative Report, as presented to Council in May. In the coming year, the committee intends to follow up with faculty and students involved in the undergraduate research pilot projects, and provide Council with an update on this initiative. She advised that the committee had also been involved with previewing and providing feedback on the development of the UnivRS research administration system as the first stage of that system nears completion.

13.2 Report for information: University Research Ethics Boards Annual Reports

Professor Vassileva noted that to satisfy Tri-Agency and Council expectations, the RSAW receives research ethics boards reports and provides them to Council. She referred Council to the written report.

13.3 Report for information: Responsible Conduct of Research Policy: Report on policy breaches

Professor Vassileva directed Council to the report provided in the written meeting materials.

14. International Activities Committee

14.1 Report for information: Annual report

Professor Gap Soo Chang, chair of the international activities committee, presented the report to Council. He noted that it is the second report that the committee submitted to Council this year, with the first being submitted at the February Council meeting. He reported on the activities of the committee as described in the writing meeting materials. He thanked all of the committee members for their hard work and dedication and also thanked the guest presenters for sharing their information with the committee. He concluded his comments by thanking Alex Beldan and Cathie Fornssler for their assistance to the committee.

15. Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee

15.1 Report for information: Annual report

Professor Aaron Phoenix, chair of the teaching, learning and academic resources committee, presented the report to Council. He then took a moment to acknowledge the committee members, and thanked Jay Wilson and leads of the working committees including Bev Brenna,

Deborah Lee, Marcel D'Eon and Patti McDougall. He concluded his remarks by thanking Alex Beldan and Cathie Fornssler for their support to the committee.

16. Joint Committee on Chairs and Professorships

Jim Germida, vice-provost, faculty relations and chair of the joint Board/Council committee on chairs and professorships, presented the reports to Council.

16.1 Request for decision: Saskatchewan Research Chair in Multiple Sclerosis Clinical Research

Professor Germida advised Council that he will also be recommending to the Board of Governors establishment of this chair. He noted one correction to the written meeting materials regarding this matter noting that the additional support of \$60,000 from the Centennial Enhancement Chair program will only be provided if it is awarded.

SINGH/SMITH: That Council approves the Saskatchewan Research Chair in Multiple Sclerosis Clinical Research and recommends to the Board of Governors that the Board authorize the establishment of the Chair.

CARRIED

16.2 Report for information: Annual report

Professor Germida referred Council members to the report contained in the written meeting materials.

17. Scholarships and Awards Committee

17.1 Report for information: Annual Report

Professor Gordon DesBrisay, chair of the scholarships and awards committee, presented this report to Council. He drew Council's attention to the report contained in the written meeting materials noting that he had nothing to add to the report. He thanked the members of the committee and especially the staff support from SESD including Wendy Klingenberg and Arvelle Van Dyck.

18. Other business

There was no other business.

19. Question period

A Council member noted that the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre had recently been recognized and questioned Council's approval of the Confucius Centre at the University of Saskatchewan, when many other universities had declined the invitation to have a Confucius Centre. He asked that the international activities committee consider developing guidelines or policies that Council could consider for adoption when exploring relationships with countries that have repressive regimes. The chair of Council advised that this would be referred to the international activities committee.

## 20. Adjournment

The chair provided closing remarks prior to adjournment noting his thanks for the work of the chairs of the standing committees and especially recognized those chairs who were completing their terms or retiring from the university including: Gordon DesBrisay; Hans Michelmann; Aaron Phoenix and Carol Rodgers. Secondly he thanked all of the Council members who would not be returning to Council next year which included: Marcel D'Eon; Ralph Deters; Robert Johanson; Paul Jones; Surendra Kulshreshtha; Angela Lieverse; Yu Luo; Dwight Makaroff; Regina Taylor-Gjevre; Ludmilla Voitkovska; and Virginia Wilson. He also thanked the following members who would be leaving on sabbatical and therefore no longer members of Council including: James Brooke; Masoud Ghezlbash and Julita Vassileva. Finally he noted the following members retiring: Richard Schwier; and Hans Michelmann.

The chair then thanked the following resource officers for their assistance to make the work of Council possible: Pauline Melis, assistant provost, institutional assessment and her staff; Ivan Muzychka, associate vice-president of communication and his staff; and Beth Williamson, university secretary and her staff.

It was noted that a reception would follow the Council meeting.

PARKINSON/DESBRISAY: That the meeting be adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

CARRIED