

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Adoption of the agenda

DOBSON/MEDA: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra, chair of Council, provided opening remarks, welcoming all in attendance and noting there would be a reception in the foyer outside the Neatby-Timlin theatre to mark the first meeting of the year. He noted the importance of the year ahead as Council celebrates the 20th year anniversary of its establishment as a representative body under the *1995 University of Saskatchewan Act*. A number of activities and events are planned to mark the occasion at Council meetings throughout the year.

The chair extended a particular welcome to those student Council members and members of the USSU and GSA student executive bodies present. He also recognized the chair of the University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association (USFA) and extended regrets on behalf of members of the University of Saskatchewan Board of Governors and the Chair of University Senate, who were invited to the meeting, but had scheduling conflicts. The chair also thanked those members who attended the presentation prior to the meeting titled, "**Demystifying Kerr and King – Part 1**". A second presentation will be offered based on the interest expressed in the presentation evaluation forms.

The chair announced that Ms. Sandra Calver had been promoted to associate secretary, academic governance and in this role would provide lead support to Council. In addition to continuing as the coordinator of the planning and priorities committee, Ms. Calver will also be the key resource person to the coordinating committee, governance committee and the nominations committee. Ms. Elizabeth Williamson, university secretary, will continue to oversee the call for nominations and election of members to Council and serve as a member of the governance committee.

The chair reviewed the procedures followed for seating of voting and non-voting members, the usual procedures for debate, and requested that members of the media not record the meeting proceedings. The chair informed Council that he had been named as the recipient of a petition posted on www.change.org requesting that University Council rescind the Vision 2025 document and return the University of Saskatchewan to the people. The chair emphasized that Council has always worked and continues to work under three major principles: Council has always enjoyed academic freedom and continues to value it; Council is a collegial self-governing body and governs itself accordingly; and Council is the university's academic governance body where academic matters are considered and decisions are made.

The chair reminded members that nominations for election as member at large (one-year term) and election to faculty representative, Western College of Veterinary Medicine close on September

19th. Members were asked to discuss the importance of Council with their colleagues and to make others aware of the opportunity to serve Council by standing for election.

In closing, the chair noted that he would need to leave the meeting early due to travel, and would at that time request that Professor Bob Tyler, vice-chair of Council, chair the remainder of the meeting.

3. Minutes of the meeting of June 19, 2014

WOTHERSPOON/BRENNNA: That the Council minutes of June 19, 2014 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

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

The chair provided the background to the motion, which was submitted and considered by Council at its June 19, 2014 meeting, with the end result of approval of a motion to postpone considering the motion until the September, 2014 meeting of Council. According to Kerr and King, a motion to rescind a previously approved substantive motion is not amendable and approval is by a majority of the votes cast. 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 stated his reason for introducing the motion was quite narrow and specific, and had as its basis the fact that the Vision 2025 document represented the leadership of a president who, a few weeks after Council approving the Vision 2025 statement, was removed from her position by the Board of Governors. Therefore, it did not seem reasonable to him to bind the institution and the acting or future presidents to the previous president's statement, irrespective of whether the vision statement was a good and useful statement or a poor statement. The issue was that a president, who shortly thereafter ceased to be president, championed the statement. He recalled the discussion at the June Council meeting and conveyed his own view of the discussion: that those who opposed the motion believed the good in the vision statement would be lost if the motion was rescinded, and that those who favoured the motion saw the events over the past two years as disastrous, and viewed the motion as a means to express their dissatisfaction. Professor Rigby indicated that he had been heavily involved in planning at the institution over the past ten years. Based on the degree to which others have interpreted the motion as an indictment of planning, he noted that he no longer supported the motion and would be voting against it. He concluded his remarks by expressing that he was very interested to hear the debate and perspectives of his fellow councilors.

The chair indicated the motion was before Council and open for debate. A Council member conveyed his respect for Professor Rigby's opinion and the complicated matter of the document before Council, and indicated that he was speaking in favour of the motion. He noted that competing understandings will exist after the vote is taken either way and compared the vote to a referendum vote, where feelings run high and there are good arguments on both sides. He recalled that Council approved the vision statement with a ringing endorsement after President Busch-Vishniac agreed to remove one section of the document when he objected to its managerial overreach. He compared the document to TransformUS and expressed the hope that just as the university can salvage the best outcomes and insights of TransformUS so is the university able to salvage the very best of the

Vision 2025 document. However, due to the opening tone of the document, he believed the vision document should be rescinded and that a new document be created.

A Council member spoke in favour of the motion, indicating that the basis for her opinion was due to the inadequate process of consultation, with less than a week of feedback provided for the latest version of the document circulated. She also noted that she did not see the changes President Busch-Vishniac agreed to make in the document before Council. She proposed that Council rescind the document, and that the document be resubmitted to Council in its entirety for further discussion at the next two meetings of Council followed by a vote. The university secretary confirmed that an oversight had occurred and the document before Council did not reflect the amendments approved by Council when it approved the Vision 2025 document in April 2014, and it should have reflected those.

A newly appointed Council member expressed his confusion regarding the document, and whether the document represented another exercise in top-down planning or whether the objections were simply puffery. He indicated his concern is that too much of the university's budget is being diverted away from the students and teaching and being directed toward building a research-intensive university.

The chair noted that prior to the Council meeting, a member of Council provided him with signed copies of a petition urging University Council to rescind the Vision 2025 document. The chair read from the cover note: "Now that Busch-Vishniac has been removed from the presidency, it is time for the university to turn the page and rethink its vision, building on the present Mission Statement, which begins: 'The University of Saskatchewan belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. As an academic community, our mission is to achieve excellence in the scholarly activities of teaching, discovering, preserving and applying knowledge.' A motion to rescind Vision 2025 will be voted upon at the September 18, 2014 Council meeting. Should it pass, this motion will keep the current U of S Mission Statement in place until a new President and the U of S community determine otherwise." The petition reads, "We, the undersigned, support the founding and historic promise that the University of Saskatchewan belongs to the people and therefore respectfully request that the University Council rescind Vision 2025." The chair indicated that he wanted to share the substance of the petition with Council so that members were aware of the petition and what people were being asked to sign. The chair advised that he had been informed that approximately 360 individuals had signed the petition.

A Council member recalled that the history of the approval of the 1993 Mission Statement was not without controversy and that there was much discussion leading up to the presentation of the final document regarding what would now be referred to as Aboriginal engagement as being core to the document. The reference to Aboriginal engagement was excised from the document, and the document was narrowly passed. He noted that the university is now entering what could be termed as an interlude stage and that it is not yet known what the end of that interlude will be. Therefore, he asked members of Council to think carefully about turning away from a clear statement of Aboriginal engagement in the new mission statement within the Vision 2025 document.

A Council member noted that he found the revisionist approach distasteful as it seems as though the processes for questioning TransformUS have failed and as a result of a series of particular actions, President Busch-Vishniac is no longer the president. He noted that Council was not part of the decision to change the leadership, and that therefore he would be voting against the motion.

A Council member spoke of the culture of fear he has observed existing on campus the last few years, which has worked its way into the workings of Council. He noted that he had raised questions at Council on behalf of different Council members due to this fear. Although Council is a

collegial representative body, almost every person in the room has a person of authority over them also in the room. Administration asks that Council members engage critically at Council, while at the same time many members wish as a protective mechanism to stay quiet for fear they may lose their job if they speak out. He noted the events of this spring demonstrate that this fear is not irrational. He stated that Council members should vote their conscience in the manner they believe to be appropriate, and that for this reason he was going to vote for the motion, in support of the creation of a new vision document undertaken in a spirit of collegial cooperation.

A Council member commented on the rushed consultation process, particularly in the latter stages of the document's development. She noted many members of the university are confused about the priorities of the university due to TransformUS, and that many of these values are also reflected in the vision document. For these reasons, she stated she would vote in favour of the motion. She further noted that rescinding the approval of the document does not prevent those ideas regarded as valuable from being retained and reflected in a new document.

A member indicated he would speak against the motion as a large majority carried the approval of the vision document, and that for Council to now rescind its approval would be a direct reversal of its earlier opinion. He indicated that there are many good elements to the document, and that the document might be revised in the future. He expressed that he did not perceive any particular risk to members as a result of speaking their mind at Council and encouraged all members to speak their minds.

A non-member of Council who identified himself as the vice-president of the Indian Teacher Education Program Student Council encouraged Council members to make a fresh start and create a new document, which would reflect goals related to Aboriginal initiatives developed in consultation with Aboriginal students.

A Council member noted that individuals from the community, in addition to the university community, signed the petition. She recalled that the 2002 vision document was eloquent, confident and inspiring, whereas she found the Vision 2025 document disturbing as it contained an operational section on planning, containing statements, such as, "We will define a set of performance indicators." For this reason, she indicated she intended to vote in favour of the motion.

A non-member spoke of the use of language in the Vision 2025 document and expressed that in his opinion the document read as though it were written by technocrats rather than those with a gift for eloquence and inspiration. Another non-member agreed, noting that the document was terribly written, and that its emphasis on team experience and team research would never tempt any first-class minds to join the university. Several other non-members also spoke against the document and urged Council members to vote in favour of the motion due to the damaging events over the past months, citing that the document was created at a time when social justice was lacking and the governance model of the university consisted of 'perp' walks off campus. As TransformUS has largely been rescinded, Council members were urged to also rescind the Vision 2025 document, due to its close association with TransformUS.

The chair invited Professor Rigby to provide any closing remarks regarding the motion. Professor Rigby deferred the question to Professor Lisa Kalynchuk, seconder of the motion. Professor Kalynchuk indicated she planned to vote against the motion for the same reasons identified by Professor Rigby, namely that the spirit of the motion has been taken out of the context she and Professor Rigby intended. She also noted that having been involved with TransformUS that she believed the Vision 2025 document was distinct from the TransformUS process.

The chair called for the vote.

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.

CARRIED (39 in favour, 27 opposed)

A non-member inquired whether the suggestion made at the June Council meeting that the international activities committee consider developing guidelines or policies about the university's relationships with countries with repressive regimes had been referred to the committee. The chair confirmed that the suggestion had been referred to the international activities committee.

5. Report of the President

President Gordon Barnhart extended congratulations to Council chair Professor Jay Kalra for being among the 2013 RBC top 25 Canadian immigrant award winners and commended Professor Kalra on this accomplishment. The president also expressed appreciation to the USSU and GSA student bodies for organizing a safe welcome week for students. He also commended Carol Rodgers, dean of the College of Kinesiology and Basil Hughton, athletic director of Huskie Athletics for taking the action to initiate drug testing for members of the football team and suspending the student who tested positive, despite being under no obligation to take this action under the rules of any sporting organization. The president indicated that this action clearly demonstrates to others, including other Canadian universities, that the University of Saskatchewan does not condone cheating.

The president continued his introductory comments by indicating the university campus has just come through a crisis. As the university moves forward there are many positive activities to celebrate, and he named several of these, such as, the recent job and career fair hosted at the university which was attended by hundreds of students and had over 140 displays and the recent \$5.0 M donation from the Canola Growers' Association to fund a chair in teaching and research in the College of Agriculture and Bioresources. He stated his belief in the university's governance model and his great respect for academic freedom and treating people with dignity and respect.

Over the summer, the president noted he attended the senior leadership forum retreat, met with deans, student members of the USSU and GSA, Council committee chairs, donors and alumni, and many others. As a result, he discovered that the mood and tenor on campus has greatly improved. Although much work remains, his belief is that the experiences the university has undergone will make it stronger as an institution.

Dr. Barnhart spoke of his role as interim president, and its various internal and external obligations. Externally, he will continue to work with donors who have expressed concern regarding the events at the university over the past months. Internally, over the coming months, he will spend time working with the provost and others to formulate a plan regarding institutional priorities. A set of eight institutional priorities has been identified, and he suggested that time to be taken to give careful consideration as to how to advance these priorities. Other changes, which were part of TransformUS, will continue to be considered by various colleges in a college-upward as opposed to a top-down approach. He expressed the hope that this approach would meet with Council's approval, and that he also hoped to have further discussion with Council regarding this strategy.

As the university is now healthy financially, the president indicated that change can be undertaken not with a budget deficit in mind, but with the promise and mission in mind to be one of the best universities in Canada. His commitment is to ensure the university will continue to be a good

steward of its financial resources, and to work to continue to create a positive atmosphere and move forward together.

6. Report from the Provost's Office

Interim provost and vice-president academic Ernie Barber extended greetings to Council members and visitors. He noted his role is one of supporting the wellbeing of the university's academic mission and ensuring university priorities are aligned with resources. He expressed that he felt challenged and privileged to serve the university especially at this time. Over the past few months, he has listened and engaged with many people throughout the university and needs to continue to listen to others.

Although there are some who do not agree with the vision to be a top tier research-intensive university, Dr. Barber indicated that he heard those voices in opposition as a calibrating voice, to ensure that we explain not only what we are doing, but also why we are doing it. There is an overall sense that deans need to have a larger role directly in shaping our academic enterprise and that priority is given to rebuilding and rebalancing our relationships and demonstrating respect for diversity. Confidence is required to make difficult decisions in the face of uncertainty and to be strong advocates for the university as a place of learning and discovery even when there is a disagreement about decisions.

The senior leadership forum retreat in August resulted in the affirmation that the university must enhance its outcomes in learning and distance education, that the university must be focused and see resources as a means to an end, that people are to be treated with respect, diversity is critical, commitment to academic freedom is essential, and that relationships require work and commitment. Dr. Barber reiterated the commitment to work more collaboratively with Council and Council committees. The TransformUS action plan has been replaced by a smaller set of eight projects, which will integrate with the priorities of the university's integrated plan. Other projects will continue in a more decentralized fashion utilizing a process that maximizes resource allocation.

Dr. Barber concluded his remarks by acknowledging the pain many have experienced on campus. He indicated that all people should be treated with respect and should not fear making their views known, including deans who should bring forward their perspectives on all items before Council. There are more decisions to make and hard work ahead. However, as the university emerges from a budget adjustment process into relative financial stability, the intent is to continue to set priorities, ensure resources are fully aligned with those priorities and make decisions collectively and collegially.

Vice-president of finance and resources, Greg Fowler gave a brief presentation, attached as appendix B, as a first step to assist Council and promote a broad understanding of the university's financial situation. The presentation has been informed by discussions with deans and senior administrative leaders and the planning and priorities committee of Council.

Mr. Fowler indicated the provincial audit is an extensive audit and all controls, from procurement to financial reports, are reviewed. The university's audited financial statements are presented to the Board for approval in July, after which the provincial auditor's annual report is submitted to the provincial government and tabled in the legislature in October. Copies are available online and retained in the university archives for seven years; a limited number of hard copies are distributed.

The university's overall consolidated 2013/14 revenues were \$1.0 B. The operating budget and reserve is \$484.0 M. As reported to Council last June, \$32.0 M in savings overall has been achieved since 2012. As a result, the university is in a different and better financial situation than in 2012.

A slide was provided showing the actual operating budget revenues and expenses over time since 2006/07 and projected out to 2015/16. Mr. Fowler pointed out that the projected divergence between operating budget revenue and expenses is projected as much less in the future, than that seen in the actuals of 2012/13. With reference to the deficit, he emphasized that in speaking of the deficit, the reference has always been a projected deficit, as the university has not incurred a deficit in the past few years. He indicated that the monies allocated to colleges are held in their funds and unspent monies in college funds do not revert back to central accounts.

Meetings are occurring among financial teams to consider inviting members of Council to come together in smaller work groups if members have specific questions about the university's budget, which they want answered. Mr. Fowler indicated his job does not entail resource allocation. The president and provost allocate resources and his job as vice-president of finance and resources is to explain resource allocations. He closed by indicating that his team, together with Mr. Jeff Dumba, associate vice-president, Financial Services Division, is open to providing more financial information to Council.

Questions were invited. The provost was asked his opinion of the consequences and implications to the university's teaching mission as resources are directed toward its research mission. The provost observed that every single university among the U15 grouping of universities is noted for its student success in addition to its research success. Students in a research-intensive environment have a different experience than in a non-research-intensive environment. At a research-intensive university, students experience the environment as a place where learning is important, and the creation of new knowledge and the categorization and explanation of that knowledge are also important. In this manner, both the learning and discovery missions are lifted up.

A member asked about the institutional priority to "align our administrative services culture to support and facilitate our academic mission" noting that all faculty are interested in being better teachers and researchers, but there is an increasing administrative burden associated with teaching and doing research. The provost indicated that the intent is to focus administrative services so they demonstrably support our mission in learning and discovery. A leader will be identified for each of the eight strategic priorities, and each leader will communicate goals and timelines to Council. The vice-president finance and resources will lead the administrative services institutional priority.

The difficulty faced by some departments in mounting their programs due to loss of faculty members as a result of the retirement incentive plan was raised. In particular, it was claimed that the Department of Mathematics and Statistics was missing instructors for 18 of its courses in the second term. The provost acknowledged this concern and indicated that an urgent priority is to work with deans to reinvest resources to address the non-strategic withdrawal of faculty resources that occurred in response to the retirement incentive plan as an operating budget adjustment measure.

A non-member referred to the provost's statement that an important decision was made over a decade ago for the university to be one of Canada's tier one universities and noted that saying the university will be research intensive did not make it so without providing sufficient resources. The province also needs a broad based comprehensive education for Aboriginal students. In response, Dr. Barber indicated he was not convinced that the university did not have the resources to be active and influential in research at the local, global and national scale, in some cases. From its founding with the establishment of a college of agriculture, the university has been engaged with research. The expectation of the province is that the university will be engaged in teaching and learning, knowledge creation and knowledge dissemination. The university is informed by its

interaction with communities, and the goal to engage more with Aboriginal communities is not antithetical to the goal of being research intensive.

In response to a question from a Council member as to where the university stands among U15 members with respect to revenue from trusts and endowments, Mr. Fowler indicated that he did not have that information readily available but could provide it at the next meeting. From previous comparisons, he surmised that the university's standing would be quite low for many reasons, including a lower population.

7. Student Societies

7.1 Report from the USSU

Desirée Steele, vice-president, academic affairs of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union (USSU) presented the report to Council. She spoke of the fresh mood on campus with the dissipation of TransformUS. She thanked the interim president and provost for making the right decision to rectify the process and come back together again as a community, recovering respect, collegiality, and academic integrity and shared investment.

The USSU is eager to move the university in the direction of the eight strategic priorities and partner with administration and the wider university community in this realization, in a fuller way than in the past. She spoke of the USSU's confidence in the ability and desire of the interim president and interim provost to carry out the core issues of learning and discovery as emphasized in the past months, and noted the many opportunities for conversations the president and provost have created with the USSU. She concluded by thanking those in attendance for their demonstrated commitment to governance and the university.

7.2 Report from the GSA

Izabela Vlahu, president of the Graduate Students' Association (GSA), presented the report to Council. The GSA has been active over the summer trying to make the association more efficient, for instance moving entirely to electronic communication to book the GSA Commons. She recognized the president's attendance at the Graduate Students' Association Orientation and reported the event was successful, safe, well attended and featured many student presentations and performances.

The GSA's priorities are likely to change over the course of the year, but core priorities include the active engagement of graduate students in university governance as elected members. The graduate student body is pleased with the direction the interim president has taken. The GSA is dedicated to working with members of the university to ensure the university will come out in a stronger position, but there is concern for the wellbeing of the university as a result of the faculty positions lost through the retirement incentive plan.

Ms. Vlahu thanked the College of Graduate Studies and Research for the support the college makes to the GSA each year, noting in particular the increased support received this year for student bursaries. In closing, she invited all in attendance to the GSA and USFA co-sponsored event on September 30th which will feature guest speaker Dr. Jim Turk, executive director, Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), speaking on *Academic Freedom: Basic versus Innovative Research*.

The chair excused himself and vice-chair Professor Bob Tyler assumed the role of chair.

8. Planning and priorities committee

Dr. Lisa Kalynchuk, chair of the planning and priorities committee, presented the committee items.

8.1 Item for information: Report on Annual Capital

Professor Kalynchuk noted the Annual Capital Plan identifies major capital projects, priorities and activities, and forms part of the multi-year capital plan. The committee's feedback on the document influenced the revisions to the final version of the document, which was submitted to the Board of Governors for approval last June. A member asked why the committee's report and suggested revisions were not submitted to Council for approval prior to submission of the document to the Board, as the committee is subordinate to Council. Professor Kalynchuk asked that Council in this matter trust the committee to do its best to provide feedback as a representative agent of Council, based on the knowledge the committee will report back to Council.

8.2 Item for information: 2015-16 Operations Forecast

Professor Kalynchuk noted that a summary of the feedback provided on the draft 2015-16 Operations Forecast could be found in the committee's report. Rather than go over the suggested revisions, she took the opportunity to report to Council on the recent meeting she attended regarding the 2015-16 Operations Forecast held with representatives of the Ministry of Advanced Education and the Treasury Board. She noted she was impressed by the thoroughness of the government attendees and their interest in the eight strategic priorities identified by the interim president and interim provost. At the meeting, university officials explained the challenges and opportunities that faced the university based upon possible operating grant increases of 0%, 2% and 4%. Topics of particular interest to the government included the College of Medicine restructuring and the university's financial sustainability.

9. Academic programs committee

Professor Roy Dobson, chair of the academic programs committee, presented the reports to Council. He advised that both items were presented to Council for comment and feedback in June. The academic programs committee is extending the timeframe for consultation on the revised documents, and therefore both items are once again before Council for feedback and response. He asked that any suggestions be emailed to alex.beldan@usask.ca.

9.1 Request for input: Proposed Academic Courses Policy revisions

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

10. Nominations committee

Professor Ed Krol, chair of the nominations committee, presented the reports to Council.

10.1 Request for decision: Scholarship and Awards Committee

The chair indicated that new members were sought for the scholarship and awards committee due to resignations. The vice-chair called three times for nominations from the floor. There were none.

KROL/WOTHERSPOON: That Council approve the nominations of Robert Scott, Department of Chemistry and Ravi Chibbar, Department of Plant Sciences to the Scholarships and Awards Committee, for three-year terms respectively ending June 30, 2017.

CARRIED

The second motion was presented. The vice-chair called three times for any nominations. There were none.

KROL/WOTHERSPOON: That Council approve the nomination of Ravi Chibbar, to serve as Chair of the Scholarship and Awards Committee for a term ending June 30, 2015.

CARRIED

10.2 Item for information: Nominations of GAA members to the Search Committee for the President

Professor Krol indicated that a call for expressions of interest to GAA members to consider serving on the search committee for the president had been issued by the nominations committee, and he encouraged members of Council to consider serving in this capacity or to nominate other GAA members. The nominations committee intends to submit the names of the nominees selected to Council at the October Council meeting. Nominations may also be made from the floor.

There was some discussion of what is meant by ensuring broad representation among those nominated to serve. Professor Krol clarified that if for example a dean of a small college were selected to serve on the committee, the nominations committee would avoid nominating a second individual to the committee from the same college. The committee's intent is to obtain the best combination of viewpoints across a range of variables, for example, ensuring that among the four GAA nominees there is a junior faculty member and a senior faculty member.

11. Other business

There was no other business noted.

12. Question period

There was a question of President Barnhart regarding Arbitrator Sims decision of the USFA grievance against the university, and whether the administration would appeal the decision. Dr. Barnhart indicated the matter is before the president's executive committee and that he would contact the USFA chair in the next few days once a decision was made.

13. Adjournment

SINGH/ALBRITTON: That the meeting be adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

CARRIED

All present were invited to the reception in the foyer to mark the opening of the academic year and to welcome new members.

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, October 23, 2014