

*Attendance: See Appendix A for listing of members in attendance.*

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Adoption of the agenda

KALYNCHUK/ZELLO: *To adopt the agenda as circulated.*

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

Dr. Kalra conveyed the usual procedures for debate and discussion and outlined the important business before Council. Beth Williamson, university secretary, provided a report on elections of members at large. In response to the call for nominations to the 15 three-year-term and the 4 one-year term member at large positions that will become vacant, 16 nominations were received. Pursuant to Council bylaws, an election must be held to determine the length of term of those GAA members now acclaimed as members at large. Once this election is held, a second call for nominations will be made for the three member at large positions with one-year terms that were not filled.

*[Secretary's Note: Since the Council meeting one of the nominees volunteered to fill a one-year term, so the first 16 nominees were elected by acclamation. A second call has been made for the three remaining one-year terms.]*

3. Minutes of the meeting of January 21, 2016

FLYNN/DOBSON: *That the Council minutes of January 21, 2016 be approved as circulated.*

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

The chair noted one item of business arising from the minutes as recorded under item 6. *Report of the Provost and Vice-president Academic*, consisting of a request for more information on the labs in the Thorvaldson Building. Greg Fowler, vice-president, finance and resources responded to the request, reporting that the long-term plan for the Thorvaldson Building is for the space to be used for academic office space, classrooms, and limited wet lab space on the third floor of the northwest side of the building. The teaching laboratories on the first floor with wet lab space will continue to be used for this purpose as the ventilation and mechanical systems in place are adequate for this type of laboratory usage.

5. Report of the President

President Peter Stoicheff presented the president's report to Council. The president described his recent trip to Ottawa as positive, and spoke of the individuals he met with within the various ministries as being open, accessible, and having an awareness of the university as a member of the U15 and as supportive of Aboriginal students and their communities.

Discussions included the anticipated increase in federal Tri-agency funding, increased support for basic research as opposed to targeted research, and the new federal Building Canada Plan. The plan will provide an economic stimulus to the provinces. Although it is unlikely universities will receive funding in the upcoming budget, the president indicated it was clear that the relevant ministries understand the infrastructure crisis that universities are experiencing so infrastructure funding is expected in the future.

President Stoicheff congratulated all who contributed to the success of Aboriginal Achievement Week, and acknowledged in particular the president of the USSU. The president also drew members' attention to the signing of the MOU with the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation at the University of Manitoba and the opening of the Gordon Oakes Red Bear Student Centre. The president concluded his remarks by providing additional information on the question about whether the amount of tax paid by employees at the university is equivalent to the amount of the provincial grant. He noted the question was likely prompted by the indication from the University of Regina that the two amounts were on par for that university.

## 6. Report of the Provost

John Rigby, interim associate provost of Institutional Planning and Assessment (IPA) presented the provost's report to Council. Professor Rigby expressed regrets on behalf of Ernie Barber, provost and vice-president academic. Professor Rigby noted the newsletter from the provincial government on the post-secondary indicators project had been attached to the provost's report for Council's information. On behalf of Dr. Barber, he also acknowledged the service and accomplishments of Vicki Williamson as dean of the Library over the course of her two five-year terms.

The chair invited questions of Professor Rigby. A member referred to the recent announcement of new and renewed Canada Research Chairs and inquired why the university was so far below its comparator institutes, having only been awarded one CRC chair renewal. Jim Germida, vice-provost, faculty relations responded to the question, indicating that the university's allocation of CRC chairs is based on a rolling average of Tri-agency funding. The university has 32 CRC chairs, which are renewed at different times; this year, the university had only one CRC chair up for renewal.

## 7. Student societies

### 7.1 Report from the USSU

Jack Saddleback, president of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union, presented the report to Council. In addition to his written report, Mr. Saddleback referred members to the initiative of the Dalhousie Student Union to increase student member representation on the Dalhousie Senate (see: <http://dsu.ca/sites/default/files/image-uploads/DSU%20Senate%20Reform%20Proposal.pdf>).

### 7.2 Report from the GSA

Rajat Chakravarty, president of the Graduate Students' Association, presented the report to Council, reporting on the events planned for the GSA conference and gala evening, March 4-5, 2016. Other initiatives include an elections forum and meet and greet with candidates running for office in the provincial election. The GSA recently hosted the caucus of its national body and discussed graduate student advocacy at the federal level.

In response to the university's movement to indigenize the curriculum, the GSA is hosting workshops on the meaning of the word Indigenous and why Indigenization is important. A member suggested providing a much broader context to understanding indigenization by including the intergenerational effects of colonization to non-Indigenous peoples.

## 8. Planning and Priorities Committee

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

### 8.1 Request for decision – Establishment of the Canadian Institute for Science and Innovation Policy (CISIP) as a type A Centre within the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy

Professor Kalynchuk indicated that the proposed Canadian Institute for Science and Innovation Policy (CISIP) within the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy (JSGS) would provide a bridge between science and innovation to policy and governance to permit new discoveries and technological applications. Activities undertaken within the centre would fall within the three research priorities recently identified by JSGS related to innovation, science, and technology. The planning and priorities committee (PPC) recognized that the centre will enhance this area of research within the JSGS and create a platform for activities that will be more visible nationally and internationally. On a local scale, the centre is designed to maximize the impact of U of S innovations across both public and private sectors and to support large-scale research projects and applications that increasingly require a policy component.

Professor Kalynchuk reported the review process was quite lengthy given the added complexity of the centre being a joint effort between the universities of Regina and Saskatchewan. Both institutions would contribute funding to the centre and be jointly accountable for the centre. The centre would be housed at the U of S campus in space allocated to the JSGS. Given the complexities of the centre and the resources required for its activities, PPC recommended that proponents include in the proposal that the centre be reviewed after five years to ensure its sustainability and to determine whether the centre is meeting its goals.

The chair invited questions and comments about the proposal. A number of concerns were raised by members about the centre. Specific reference was made to the short length of time (ten days) to review the proposal and the belief of some Council members that the proposal was prematurely presented to Council with inadequate consultation. Tabling the motion was suggested.

Concerns about consultation focused on the level and type of consultation undertaken, which was observed to have mostly occurred with senior administrators rather than with faculty within the natural sciences, social sciences, and Indigenous studies throughout campus. There were questions about consolidating the centre in the JSGS within a small cadre of policy scientists, and the connection of the proposed centre to the Sylvia Fedoruk Centre for Nuclear Innovation, with a generalized concern about nuclear energy and clean energy within the

province. Other concerns related to the lack of consultation and connection with the health sciences, other than with the School of Public Health and the Western College of Veterinary Medicine. Members observed that those scholars that work with and study the impact of policy on local communities in the areas of health and water were not invited to have a voice in establishing the centre.

Clarity on the goals of the centre and how it might reach out to others was requested. A number of examples were provided of where the proposal referred to civil engagement with society, the areas of social justice and community safety, and Aboriginal scholarship and engagement, as university priorities, but gave no indication within the proposal of how the centre might contribute to these priority areas. The opportunity to include the policy dimensions of Indigenous peoples, particularly in the North was noted, with the potential to broaden the impact of the centre beyond the university. There was an objection to the word Canadian in the title of the centre as being disingenuous as to the scale of the centre.

As university resources are being invested in the centre, a clearer indication of how the centre will benefit students was requested. Professor Peter Phillips, the proposed academic director of CISIP in its first phase, clarified that the grants listed provide opportunities to about 30 students and post-doctoral fellows, including funding for students in the social sciences and humanities. Professor Phillips also clarified that the funding from GIFS and the Fedoruk Centre was in the form of competitive grants awarded to CISIP through a rigorous review process. Professor Kalynchuk referred members to the table in the proposal that outlined the categories of expenditures and sources of funds. The table was added at the request of PPC to clearly state the sources of funding for the centre which comes from JSGS, central funds at the U of R and the U of S, research chairs, and external funds.

Professor Phillips indicated that although the centre hopes to work with those groups not represented in its research envelope, the centre is biased at this point toward existing capacity available to the centre. Professor Kalynchuk noted that PPC focused on the specific areas of strength identified by proponents as the initial focus of the centre and observed that the discussion at Council appeared to be about the scope of the centre and its ability to address much broader issues than proponents intended. As a Type A centre within a school, CISIP will operate primarily within JSGS and is somewhat restricted in its leadership and core activity. Professor Kalynchuk indicated that the nomenclature of type A, B, C, and D centres is dated and under review. At this time, a distinguishing characteristic of the university's typology of centres is the centre's reporting structure. Due to the differing policies governing centres at both universities, establishing the centre as a Type A centre was deemed by PPC and proponents to be the clearest course of action until the nomenclature of centres is amended.

The chair stated the motion before Council was a substantive motion and asked Ms. Williamson to inform Council on how it might address this item in accordance with its rules, given the earlier reference to tabling the motion. Ms. Williamson indicated that when a substantive motion is under debate, Council may submit a procedural motion to defer discussion of the motion to another date and time. Kerr and King requires the motion to be moved and seconded. The only debate permissible is about the date and time of the postponement. A majority vote is required to carry the motion.

Professor Phillips indicated he was uncertain as to how a delay would affect the University of Regina's consideration of approval of the centre, which was planned to occur around March 9, but that a process of additional consultation could be undertaken. In response to a question

about the urgency of the approval of the centre at this time, Professor Phillips indicated that of the grants listed, a large number have already been started, and the granting agencies are hesitant about their administration without an institutional design in place.

*KALYNCHUK/de BOER: That Council approve that the establishment of the Canadian Institute for Science and Innovation Policy (CISIP) as a type A Centre within the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy (JSGS), effective upon approval of CISIP by the University of Regina Board of Governors.*

*PROCEDURAL MOTION:*

*IRVINE/CARD: That consideration of the motion be postponed to the April meeting of Council.*

CARRIED

8.2 Request for decision – Name change of the College of Graduate Studies and Research

Professor Kalynchuk observed the motion before Council is to change the name of the College of Graduate Studies and Research to the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, effective January 1, 2017. She reported that the College of Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR), under the leadership of Adam Baxter-Jones, interim dean of the college, has undertaken an extensive review of the mandate of the college over the past 24 months. During this time, the college reported out on the review to members of the college, the planning and priorities committee, Graduate Council, and Council. A significant outcome of the review was that the college remain a college, but be administratively restructured, including becoming the administrative home of the university's post-doctoral fellows (PDF's). The proposed change in name formally recognizes this new role of the college. The name change was approved by Graduate Council on February 4, 2016. The effective date of the name change will coincide with the move of the college to a new physical location.

In response to a question about the benefits that will accrue to the university's PDF's, Dean Baxter-Jones indicated that two years ago the PDF's formed a society, which was facilitated by the CGSR as the college recognized that PDF's had no voice at the university and few policies or procedures to assist PDF's. By integrating PDF's within the CGSR, the college will become the voice for all graduate trainees at the university. The college is currently in the process of hiring a full-time administrator to assist with this process. The number of PDF's at the university is increasing from approximately 180 individuals to 200 individuals, which is a sign of a research-intensive university.

A member requested that the dean of the college report back to Council at the December 2016 meeting prior to the name change taking effect, on the benefits that will accrue to PDF's by becoming part of the college. This request was supported by another member, who also requested that the dean report on whether the change places the university in line with other U15 universities. Dr. Baxter-Jones agreed to the request and reported that the change does put the college in line with other U15 universities and was part of the rationale for the name change.

*KALYNCHUK/de BOER: That Council approve that the College of Graduate Studies and Research be renamed the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, effective January 1, 2017, and that Council's Bylaws be amended to reflect the new name of the college.*

CARRIED

9. Governance Committee

The chair invited Louise Racine, chair of the governance committee to present the report and asked members of Council to join him in congratulating Professor Racine on being recently named as an influential alumna of Laval University. Members greeted this news with applause.

9.1 Request for Decision – Requirement that Elected Council Members Serve on the Student Academic Hearing and Appeals Committee

Professor Racine provided the history of the discussion of the item when presented as a notice of motion at the December Council meeting. The governance committee's intent in presenting the motion is to broaden the pool of Council members eligible to serve on student disciplinary and appeal boards to include all elected Council members, given the difficulty of forming hearing and appeal boards promptly. To avoid possible confusion, the governance committee has reworded the motion presented in December removing the word "elected" and adding the words, "other than ex officio members," so that the motion now reads, "... all Council members, other than ex officio members, be members of the student academic hearing and appeals committee." The governance committee deemed that a new notice of motion was not required as the re-wording of the motion has no effect on those eligible to serve on the student academic hearing and appeals committee—the change just clarifies the motion. Professor Racine affirmed that any member when contacted by the university secretary's office may decline to serve on a student hearing or appeal.

*RACINE/GRAY: That Council approve that all Council members, other than ex officio members, be members of the student academic hearing and appeals committee, and that the council Bylaws be amended to remove the requirement of the nominations committee to nominate members of Council to serve on the student academic hearing and appeals committee.*

CARRIED

9.2 Notice of Motion – Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee Amended Terms of Reference

Professor Racine read the notice of motion as follows:

*RACINE/FLYNN: That Council approve the amendments to the terms of reference of the teaching, learning and academic resources committee of Council as shown in the attachment.*

Professor Racine noted that if approved at the next Council meeting, the motion will modify the terms of reference to the teaching, learning and academic resources committee (TLARC) to ensure that among the members on the committee there is expertise in Aboriginal teaching and learning; the director of Aboriginal initiatives will also be named as a resource member to the committee.

Discussion of the notice of motion included whether the nominations committee was consulted about the change and how the nominations committee would identify those individuals with Aboriginal teaching and learning expertise. Professor Racine reported the nominations

committee was not consulted on the change. Professor Ed Krol, chair of the nominations committee, indicated he would discuss the change with Jay Wilson, chair of TLARC and with Professor Racine. Regardless of the process and criteria identified by the nominations committee to ensure that *“among the members from the General Academic Assembly there will be expertise in Aboriginal teaching and learning”* Professor Krol noted that in the event of additional nominations from the floor resulting in an election, the nominations committee would lose its ability to ensure that these criteria were met.

### 9.3 Request for Input – Revisions to the Regulations on Student Academic Misconduct

Professor Racine outlined the background to the revisions to the *Regulations on Student Academic Misconduct*, the consultation undertaken by the governance committee in revising the regulations, and the summary of substantive changes provided to Council. She invited feedback and comments on the revisions to be submitted to Beth Williamson at [university.secretary@usask.ca](mailto:university.secretary@usask.ca). The governance committee hopes to be in a position to submit the revised regulations to Council by June for approval.

### 10. Other business

There was no other business raised.

### 11. Question period

There were no questions during question period.

### 12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by motion (B. BRENNNA/FLYNN) at 4:35 pm.