

1. Introductions of Senate members and Chair's Opening Remarks
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Minutes of the Meeting of October 15, 2016 – pg. 3
4. Business from the Minutes
  - 4.1 Report arising from item 5.1 Vote on recommendation for Chancellor
5. President's Report – pg. 21  
(Peter Stoicheff, President)
6. Report on Undergraduate Student Activities  
(President, USSU, verbal report)
7. Report on Graduate Student Activities – pg. 30  
(President, GSA)
8. Report on Board of Governors Activities  
(Senate-elected Board Member, Joy Crawford, verbal report)
9. University Council
  - 9.1 Report on University Council Activities 2016/2017 – pg. 37  
(Lisa Kalynchuk, Chair, University Council)
  - 9.2 **Request for Confirmation** of University Council Decisions  
(Kevin Flynn, Chair, Academic Programs Committee, University Council)
    - 9.2.1 Change to Admissions Qualifications – Bachelor of Education Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP) and Indian Teacher Education Program (ITEP) – pg. 41
    - 9.2.2 Change to Admissions Qualifications – College of Medicine – pg. 46
    - 9.2.3 Direct-entry Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) program in Kinesiology with 85% Admissions Average – pg. 52
10. Senate Committee Reports
  - 10.1 **CONFIDENTIAL: For approval:** Honorary Degrees Committee Report – pg. 66
  - 10.2 Executive Committee
    - 10.2.1 Report of the Senate Executive Committee – pg. 70
    - 10.2.2 **For approval:** Appointments to Senate nominations committee – pg. 71
  - 10.3 Nominations Committee
    - 10.3.1 **For approval:** Appointments to Senate committees for 2017/2018 – pg. 72

## 10.4 Membership Committee

10.4.1 Report of the Membership Committee – *pg. 74*10.4.2 **For approval:** Removal of the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Saskatchewan as a member of Senate – *pg. 77*

## 10.5 ad hoc Bylaws Review Committee – appointment/re-appointment of Chancellor

10.5.1 **For approval:** Proposed Senate Bylaw Amendments – *pg. 78*

## 10.6 Education Committee

10.6.1 Report of the Education Committee – *pg. 83*11. Presentations

11.1 Athletic Master Plan – Greg Fowler, Vice-president, finance and resources and Chad London, Dean, Kinesiology

11.2 Galleries Reimagined –Peta Bonham-Smith, Dean, Arts and Science

Lunch break: 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

12. Senate Education Committee Discussion Topic: Technology in Research and Teaching

There will be five different sessions – groups will be drawn at random and distributed at meeting registration.

- 1) Angela Kalinowski, Department of History: “Using Video Production as an Assessment Tool in Study Abroad Settings”
- 2) Hayley Hessel, Department of Bioresource Policy, Business and Economics: “Teaching an Online Course: Agrifood Issues and Institutions”
- 3) Kevin Stanley, Department of Computer Science: “Using Cellphones to Map Social Phenomena”
- 4) Ryan Banow, Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching and Learning, and Joel Lanovaz, College of Kinesiology: “Using Technology to Improve the Classroom Experience”
- 5) Heather Ross, Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching and Learning, and Eric Micheels, Department of Bioresource Policy, Business and Economics: “Open Textbooks: Increasing Accessibility to Course Materials”

13. Items for Information

13.1 Student Enrolment Report

(Patti McDougall, Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, verbal report)

13.2 Senate Elections update

(Beth Bilson, University Secretary, verbal report)

14. Other Business15. Question Period16. Adjournment and Dates of Future Convocation and Senate Meetings

Spring Convocation: June 5-8, 2017

Fall Senate: October 21, 2017

Fall Convocation: October 28, 2017

Spring Senate: April 21, 2018

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Opening Remarks

Chancellor Favel welcomed members to the meeting in Cree and English and acknowledged that the meeting was on Treaty 6 territorial land and the homeland of the Métis. Introductions were then made by everyone present.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The president of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) asked that the agenda be amended to add a motion to endorse the upcoming Student Day of Action.

GHAITH/PULFER: That the agenda be adopted with the addition of item 8.1  
"Student Day of Action".

CARRIED

3. Minutes of the Meeting of April 23, 2016

The university secretary asked that the minutes be amended by changing the second paragraph on page 5 to read:

Dr. Chad replied that two years ago the University of Saskatchewan took on a leadership role in how Universities approached the discovery mission. The University is fully committed to the principals outlined in such guidance as the Tri-Council Policy Statement that outlines processes for respecting First Nations, Inuit and Metis people of Canada. One of the key elements in such processes is ensuring permissions from communities prior to any research undertaking through community engagement and, where appropriate, a research agreement between the research team, and the Aboriginal community relevant to the research.

GULLICKSON/WELLS: That the minutes of the meeting of April 23, 2016 be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. Business from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor

Non-Senate members left the meeting due to the confidentiality of this agenda item.

5.1 Vote on recommendation for Chancellor

This item is confidential and therefore not included in these minutes.

Guests were invited back in.

Mr. Romanow joined the meeting. He thanked Chancellor Favel for his help in the university's relationship-building with First Nations, Métis and Indigenous peoples. He then provided thanks and his commitment to the Senate, noting how much the U of S has meant to him as it was the highest dream of his parents that he attend the university and receive an exceptional education.

Mr. Romanow explained that Ukrainian was his first language and that there was often discrimination in early days based on one's place of birth and residence. He was the first and only member of his family to attend the university and even today, with his experiences in the Department of Political Studies, he still burns with pride when students come to attend the university. He noted that he was greatly honored to accept this position as it provides an opportunity for him to give back to a very special place that has given so much to him and his family.

Mr. Romanow expressed the amazing agenda that the U of S has had from the beginning – in that differences that divide us are to be set aside to allow us to live and learn together. This continues to be the ongoing experiment called Saskatchewan, and indirectly Canada. The university's graduates and faculty have demonstrated the excellence of the province to the world. Graduates of this university leave with a desire and will to serve and make a positive change to people in their communities wherever they live.

Mr. Romanow expressed his goal to serve President Stoicheff – a tremendous leader of the university who has a difficult role as president – and to work with the Board of Governors, faculty, students, alumni and members of Senate to continue to strive for the improvement of the lives of people in Canada and across the world and by doing so strengthening the hopes and dreams of our families and province. Mr. Romanow then committed to do his very best to build this university to become the best it can.

## 6. President's Report

President Stoicheff commented that his written report to Senate was in the meeting materials and drew Senate's attention to several important items. The first was that the university was on top of the wave which started long before he became president and was the result of long, thoughtful decisions made over many years. He noted the following recent events as support for this view:

- The U of S is a member of the U15. There are approximately 100 universities in Canada and the U15 is a group of 15 universities that are research intensive medical-doctoral universities. This is an influential group, which was evidenced in the extent of the grants provided to universities in last spring's federal budget due to lobbying of the U15 and Universities Canada. Canada does not have a diverse network of national labs – so when this country looks to its innovation agenda and connecting up the great minds that are doing research (creative or targeted) and then connecting those findings with industry and larger society – it looks to the U15 that do very good research at a very high level.

The purpose of the U15, including the U of S, is to inspire and support students, and build research and discovery into the student experience.

- Several years ago the federal government established Canada Excellence Research Chairs and then a few years ago the Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF) was established. In CFREF's first round the U of S Global Institute for Food Security was awarded one of five awards; then in the second competition we were again successful with the Global Institute for Water Security receiving an award – making the U of S the only university in the country to receive two CFREF's. President Stoicheff recognized Dr. Karen Chad, vice-president research for the leadership she has shown in this area and her definitive role in this success. He noted that these awards were very significant and put the university on the international map. They also provide a tremendous advantage to our students in numerous ways, such as: enabling the university to hire many students over the next seven years at the undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral levels; when the best faculty from around the world are aspiring to have a position at a strong university they look to universities such as ours and are attracted to our institution – which is a great thing for students; and when students from around the world decide where they want to study – they look to universities where their degrees will be recognized for this type of activity. So this truly benefits students and adds to the value of their degrees.
- The university received federal funding for a collaborative research science building, being built behind the Biology Building, that will bring expertise from a variety of disciplines together to work from different perspectives to solve complex situations.
- Canada Excellence Research Chairs – of which we have two of the 27 in the country, with one being held by Dr. Leon Kochian in Food Systems and Security; and the other by Dr. Howard Wheeler in Water Security.

The president noted that he did not have time at the last Senate meeting to provide an in-depth account on the work being done on Indigenous engagement – so he included an outline in the written report for this meeting. A lot of this work has been led by Patti McDougall, vice-provost teaching and learning, Chancellor Favel and many others in the university. He encouraged all Senators to read this part of his written report.

President Stoicheff explained that all universities have Vision, Mission and Values documents. At the U of S it was time to take stock of who we are, what we are doing, and where we think we are going and develop a new document because so much has changed since 1993 when our last mission statement was developed. The president stressed the importance of Senate and all other members of the university community understanding and identifying these documents, because there has been ambiguity and confusion expressed at times concerning what we think we are and what we think we aspire to be. He explained that the other reasons for setting the visioning exercise in motion were because: the university had come through a difficult patch in the last couple years and if we develop a document that is really inspirational of what we can do it will be good for the morale and level of conversation we will be able to have; and increasingly in the PSE sector in our country and province, it is important for universities to be able to distinguish themselves – to show in some ways (although not all ways) that we are different from other universities. President Stoicheff explained that our history, character, and future distinguishes us, which is also very important for our main funders – the provincial and federal

governments – to understand. It is important for our future, our financial future and our sustainability.

The president described a variety of mistakes and pitfalls that he wanted this document to avoid, such as being too generic, and having meaningless aspirations, superlatives and an unrealistic vision. Also, it is not meant to be a strategic planning document, nor merely a recreation of the previous mission document with different language. Rather it is to be a very short, essential, pithy document that is appropriately visionary and aspirational, while also being practical and realistic.

President Stoicheff explained the process followed to produce the document. The president appointed a committee, chaired by two senior and highly regarded faculty members, which conducted the consultation and drafted the document. There was representation on the committee from throughout the university community, including students and three Aboriginal people (an elder, faculty member and staff member). The committee arrived at a document that the president was extremely enthusiastic about and believed met all the criteria he sought. The president then invited questions.

A Senator commended the president on the development of the vision and its support for Aboriginal peoples. She referred to the Northern Teacher Education Program (NORTEP) that has been running in northern Saskatchewan for 40 years which recently had its funding from the provincial government cut and suggested a joint program from the U of S and U of R could help. She asked whether the university had taken a position on this. The president noted that the provincial government did not discuss or negotiate this with the university prior to the province making its decision and that the university takes this situation extremely seriously. He invited Michelle Prytula, dean of the College of Education to comment. Dean Prytula expressed the importance of the situation and explained that since the decision was made they had been working broadly across the university and with the Ministry of Advanced Education. So far all of the partners were open to multiple solutions and she anticipated that more concrete ideas would be in place by March or April.

A Senator sought permission to ask questions about business arising from the minutes and the nomination of the chancellor, and was informed that these agenda items had already been addressed and she could bring her questions during question period at the end of the meeting. She then asked whether Mr. Romanow was still a member of the Political Studies Faculty. The president explained that Mr. Romanow had an appointment as a chair within the College of Arts and Science, but that he was not a member of faculty, and this was reviewed in advance and it was not seen as a conflict of interest. He also noted that there are a number of chancellors across the nation who have involvement with faculties. The Senator noted that her concern was that traditionally the chancellor brings a voice from the community and she thought it was quite diluted here – and on the Board of Governors this could be a factor that could upset the voting and suggested this may not meet with the Conflict of Interest Policy. Chancellor Favel refuted this suggestion explaining that for every matter considered by the Board of Governors the chair asks for all conflicts to be named and at that time individuals name their conflicts and do not vote on matters on which they are conflicted. He also believed Mr. Romanow had the highest level of integrity. The Senator explained that she was considering nominating another member as chancellor but did not because they had a position at the university – and if this was made known at the beginning she would have nominated them.

The Senator also noted her concern that she believed the voice of the community was limited at the university. Chancellor Favel stressed the importance of knowing that the agenda for Senate is set by Senate Executive which is a committee of Senators.

A Senator noted that the field surface at the Huskie Stadium is at the end of its cycle and it is a great community tool that is important to keep up. He asked if there were plans to move forward to have an all-season track for U of S students and the community. The president explained that the track around the field has been there for many years and repaired multiple times, and it is unable to be repaired again. Discussions with the Track and Field Association about a different location on university grounds are ongoing. The president noted he would be surprised if the university did not have a new track in the future.

A Senator asked that the possible conflict of interest regarding Mr. Romanow's position be discussed with Mr. Romanow. President Stoicheff replied that the appointment for Mr. Romanow in the College of Arts and Science was not a full-time faculty appointment. He has a chair position which allows him to interact with students informally, participate in teaching part of one course and undertake some of the research that he is interested in doing which involves writing. The president advised that he saw no conflict of interest but rather an enormous opportunity for students. If there was a conflict of interest at the board level – Mr. Romanow would have to declare it. Chancellor Favel noted that his people use elders as a library and it is a sad day when we lose that knowledge; similarly, we have Mr. Romanow's experience building Canada first hand and he questioned why we would not want this in the classroom.

#### 6.1 Mission, Vision and Values statement

Co-chairs Brent Cotter and Liz Harrison provided comments on the work of the visioning committee.

Liz Harrison, associate dean of the School of Physical Therapy, noted her pleasure in being able to present the final vision, mission and values of the university to Senate. She thanked the committee members, being representatives from the faculty, staff, Board of Governors, Senate, Council students and community, for their excellent support over the past year. Dr. Harrison reviewed the process and work of the committee which included many consultations that formed the basis of the document along with other inputs such as information obtained through two online surveys. In June the committee released a draft document to the community, Council and Board – seeking feedback from everyone. The majority of comments received were on phrasing and wording, and otherwise supporting the broader concepts in the document. The committee has waited until fall to allow more interaction with students and others. The committee was confident that the content of the document is solid and represents what they heard during their discussions and will inform the work of the university. The mission, vision and values statement will come to Council next week for approval and then to the Board of Governors later in the month.

Brent Cotter, professor and former dean of the College of Law, explained that they have been inspired during this process to learn of the 'positiveness' and enthusiasm that so many people have about this university – particularly in the communities beyond the university. Their product is a high-level document that articulates: the nature of the university; mission of what we have for the province and beyond; and an achievable vision. Mr. Cotter spoke to the document itself being respectful of a creative artist

community. It is dedicated to inspiring and enriching students in becoming engaged global citizens. There is a focus on commitment to emerging strengths regarding research, and a commitment to teaching and engagement. It also includes a significant commitment to partnership with Indigenous and Métis communities. It contains the principles to which we commit and values that represent how we live. Mr. Cotter explained that they opted not to define the values – and that the committee thought they constituted the life-force of the mission and vision.

A Senator commended the humanitarian work of the president, but noted that the document may have been stronger if a few adjectives could have been modified – questioning why ‘unique’ was repeated. He noted that he meant this in no way to be of criticism. Chancellor Favel stated his appreciation of the comment, and that comments were invited, but no changes were being accepted for the document, and following the discussion a vote would be taken on the motion.

A Senator asked how the phrase, ‘Indigenous and Métis people’ came about, and the Chancellor noted he had that question as well.

Another Senator asked what was meant by ‘collegiality’ to which Mr. Cotter replied that he thought it had a couple of dimensions – both a cross-reach dimension and relating cross-collegially with one another – but the committee invited people to define ‘collegiality’ in the context of their own work environments and did not want to dictate the definition.

A Senator noted that he did not want to change the document, but after discussions late in the summer and in early fall that he had with a fellow Senator, the president and Mr. Cotter, where there was a meeting of the minds, he was asking if there was any room to put beside this document some notes about the meanings of the principles and values. He noted he had just sent to the university secretary the latest discussion of these notes. Mr. Cotter replied that a sidebar of explanatory notes will not happen but he did think a presentation framework with a lead-in on peoples’ comments would likely be developed for the document but not by the visioning committee.

STOICHEFF/C. OLFERT: That Senate adopt the Vision, Mission and Values of the University of Saskatchewan as presented at the Senate meeting.

CARRIED

## 7. Report on Undergraduate Student Activities

Brooke Malinoski, USSU vice-president academic, provided the report on behalf of Kehan Fu, USSU president, who was unable to attend. Ms. Malinoski reported on the work of the USSU since May 2016, which included:

- encouraging the university to have an ombudsperson to assist students with hearings and appeals
- collaborating with the university to have more open textbooks
- consulting with college societies and other stakeholders on campus regarding tuition (some examples being hosting the Association of Constituency Presidents; and weekly face to face meetings in colleges)
- signing an MOU with the president’s office championing sustainability
- drawing attention to student housing issues,



- hosting a round table discussion with a Member of Parliament and representatives from other post-secondary institutions in Saskatchewan
- working for the mental and physical health of students through addressing accessibility and outreach of medical services to students in Veterinary Medicine and looking into expanding the USSU Health and Dental Plan
- working closely with the university to help launch the React to Sexual Assault campaign
- helping to launch the University's new USAFE app
- improving the student group experience by streamlining the applications for funding and insurance, putting them both online and improving website accessibility
- working to increase the amount of funding available to student groups

A Senator commended the USSU for its work and its assistance with the drafting of the Sexual Assault Prevention Policy.

#### 8. Report on Graduate Student Activities

Ziad Ghaith, GSA president, provided a report on the activities of the Graduate Student Association (GSA). Mr. Ghaith advised that the GSA represents 4000 graduate students and it holds promising plans to improve its role and support graduate students at the U of S. He highlighted the following three GSA initiatives:

- representation of graduate students on important university committees and more representation on University Council and University Senate
- working to address graduate students' needs and would like to identify these by conducting a survey of graduate students, hopefully in November, asking about their views on academics, wellness and tuition.
- the National Day of Action which is a Canadian student movement to request and demand government support of students in their academic life including freezing tuition, and providing academic support and improved access to Aboriginal graduate members.

Mr. Ghaith elaborated on the National Day of Action explaining that the GSA decided to support this motion and attend a rally on November 2<sup>nd</sup>. He believed the Day of Action will make a change and a difference and he encouraged Senate to endorse this movement to give hope to the students and to make education more accessible and just for everyone. The motion of endorsement was moved and seconded.

Ms. Malinoski of the USSU spoke against the motion noting that much of what was being sought at the Day of Action was for undergraduate students and she questioned the GSA speaking on behalf of undergraduate students. She informed Senate that the USSU was in the process of consulting with students about tuition but there had been no consultation between the USSU and the GSA about the Day of Action and it had not been discussed with the undergraduate students. Ms. Malinoski explained that a primary reason why the USSU would not endorse this movement was because of its affiliation with the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS). The USSU held a referendum in the past as to whether they would join the CFS; the USSU did not uphold the results although the CFS did. There was a law suit and the Court of Queen's Bench held that the CFS wrongfully extended its authority and that the USSU was not a member of the CFS. More recently there have been many questions about the CFS – and currently ten schools signed a statement that they believed the CFS does not serve their students. The USSU's opinion is that the dominant voices at the CFS are their staff's rather than the views of the students. For these reasons, Ms. Malinoski asked that Senate oppose this motion.

A Senator recommended support for this motion noting that as an alumna and current student, she was very aware of the burden of tuition and glad that the GSA was supporting this motion. Anne-Marie Roy of the CFS, a guest at Senate, spoke in response to Ms. Malinoski's comments. She explained that she, the GSA and undergraduates students had been talking to the student community as a whole. While the USSU was currently going through its process with student leaders – the CFS had been speaking to individual students and determined that students were overwhelmingly in support of the Day of Action. She noted that this was not just a day of action for members of the CFS – but for all students. Ms. Roy advised that she was in favour of collaboration on campus and as a whole, and had attempted to engage the USSU but they refused to meet with her.

An undergraduate student member of Senate spoke against the motion noting that CFS had no authority to speak on behalf of undergraduate students and that the USSU was unable to speak with the CFS because of the ongoing case. He informed Senate that the CFS had brought the USSU to court which cost the USSU \$5500 in legal fees and he was concerned about the motivation of the student Day of Action. He noted that it was somewhat insulting to think that the USSU was not concerned about tuition and that they were not mobilizing and addressing this appropriately. For these reasons he recommended Senate support the undergraduate students and not this organization.

President Stoicheff commented that he would never suggest that a student should not participate in a student Day of Action such as this one and that administration would not get involved with the student governing bodies' relationship with the CFS. He asked Senate to think about this from a different perspective, not as an issue as to whether they personally thought that a student Day of Action was supportable, but whether they believed that Senate had a role to play in this. He explained that the university considers three principles when setting tuition levels: accessibility, comparability and quality. The president noted that administration, deans and the Board think carefully about all of this, and to ask Senate to support suddenly freezing tuition was a request that he thought was not something that Senate can respond to positively.

A Senator noted that students have a charter right to hold the Day of Action if they choose to.

GHAITH/PULFER: That Senate endorse the Student Day of Action.

DEFEATED

#### 9. Report on Board of Governors Activities

Joy Crawford, one of the two Senate-elected members of the Board of Governors, reported on the activities of the Board since the last Senate meeting. She first noted how conflicts of interest were addressed at the Board level, and that she was confident they were addressed respectfully. The Board looks to whether individual board members have personal benefits or competing interests on any matters; then the first thing discussed at every Board meeting is whether anyone has any conflicts of interest with agenda items. If so, then the individual steps out of the room for the related decision.

Ms. Crawford reported that two new members joined the Board, Kehan Fu, USSU president joined on May 1, and Dr. Jay Kalra the elected faculty member on the Board joined on July 1. The Board approved the operating budget for 2016-17 with projected revenues of \$483.2M and expenses of \$500.5M. There was a projected deficit of \$17.3M for 2016-17, with the largest

contributing factor being a one-time hold back of \$20M from the College of Medicine targeted grant. The university had adequate funds to bridge this deficit and was continuing to work with its key partner, the provincial government, to ensure adequate funding into the future. While the provincial funding was announced as substantially unchanged from last year, some significant points about the funding were: the university will receive a zero percent funding increase from last year; although the \$20M holdback from the 2015-16 operating grant was reinstated, targeted funding to the College of Medicine was reduced by \$20M; funding requested for Aboriginal and international initiatives was not granted; and funding for the health sciences capital project and the Canada Excellence Research Chair in Water Security was deferred. In its funding letter the Ministry of Advanced Education outlined five expectations of all post-secondary institutions in Saskatchewan: accessible; responsive; sustainable; accountable; and quality.

Ms. Crawford advised that the university ended the 2015-16 fiscal year in a sound financial position and the Board approved the 2015-16 audited financial statements in July. The U of S had maintained a healthy balance sheet, strong cash flow, declining debt and improved internal controls. It was also a record setting year for research funding at the U of S. Ms. Crawford advised that the finances at the university were being managed quite well. Last week the Board approved a new Enterprise Risk Management Policy for the university and incorporated language acknowledging at all Board meetings that they were meeting on Treaty 6 territory and the homeland of the Métis.

In conclusion, Ms. Crawford noted that there had been some fantastic funding announcements recently, including \$30.1M from the federal government for a Collaborative Science Research Building for which the Board approved matching funding. This building will focus on projects that have potential clean-technology applications, the breeding of more drought-tolerant crops, and the development of more sustainable pest-control mechanisms.

## 10. University Council

### 10.1. Request for Confirmation of University Council Decisions

#### 10.1.1 Changes to Admissions Qualifications for the Bachelor of Education 4-year program

Prof. Kevin Flynn, chair of the academic programs committee, advised that changes of admissions qualifications approved by University Council needed to be confirmed by Senate, and that in this situation University Council's approval had not yet been obtained, but was anticipated. The proposed changes to admissions qualifications would increase out-of-province access to programs in the College of Education. The first change would expand the present policy for admissions from a student being allowed to be deficient in one of four areas to a student being allowed to be deficient in two of those four areas – although all their deficiencies needed to be cleared before the student could move to second year. The second change addressed students who had completed 18 credits of university with an average of at least 60% to stand-in for any high school pre-requisites. Prof. Flynn explained that the reason why these changes could not first be approved at next week's University Council and then brought to Senate in April was because they needed to be publicized soon to be effective by September 2017.

ATKINSON/MENZIES: That Senate confirm the anticipated approval of changes to admission qualifications for the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) 4-year program, effective for students who are entering the program in or after September 2017.

CARRIED

#### 10.1.2 Disestablishment of the Three Divisions in the College of Arts and Science

Prof. Dirk de Boer, chair of the planning and priorities committee, provided the report noting that information about the disestablishment of the divisions was in the meeting materials. This change was approved by University Council in May 2016.

HOBACK/KOPP-McKAY: That Senate confirm University Council's decision to authorize the disestablishment of the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts, the Division of Social Science, and the Division of Sciences from within the College of Arts and Science, effective November 1, 2016.

CARRIED

### 11. Senate Committee Reports

#### 11.1 Senate Executive Committee Report

Elizabeth Williamson, university secretary, presented the Senate executive committee report for information. She pointed out that Charlene Sorenson, interim dean of the Library, will speak about the library transformation project at Senate today. Secondly, the motion that came to the executive committee from the GSA was different than the motion that came forward today at Senate, as it focused on academic accommodation for students attending the protest, which was outside Senate's jurisdiction so the executive committee did not add it to Senate's agenda. Thirdly, the executive committee will be working on defining the purpose of Senate which will be brought to Senate for approval.

#### 11.2 Senate Nominations Committee Report

The university secretary presented the Senate nominations committee report on behalf of Lori Isinger, chair of the nominations committee, as she was absent with regrets. She noted that the nominations committee can fill vacancies on committees that arise between Senate meetings. As there was still one vacancy of an appointed Senator on the *ad hoc* Senate Bylaws committee, Ms. Williamson asked any interested appointed Senators to speak to her following the Senate meeting and she would communicate their interest to the nominations committee for determination.

D'EON/PROKOPCHUK: That Senate approve the two appointed (Crandall Hrynkiw, TBD), two elected (Russ McPherson, Gary Gullickson), two ex-officio (Lorne Calvert, Beth Horsburgh) and one student member (Ziad Ghaith) of Senate to the *ad hoc* Senate Bylaws review committee to amend the chancellor re-appointment process.

CARRIED

#### 11.3 Senate Membership Committee Report

Davida Bentham, chair of the Senate membership committee, presented the committee's report for information. She noted that the suggestions of the committee to improve engagement of the Senate electorate and voter turnout were set out in the report. There was no specific feedback on the committee's suggestions, although one Senator assured the committee that the lack of feedback was not an indication that Senators were not interested, as they were. The committee will work to implement its suggestions.

#### 11.4 Report of the Special Committee to Review the Standard of Student Conduct in Non-Academic Matters and Regulations and Procedures for Resolution of Complaints and Appeals

Patti McDougall, vice-provost, teaching and learning, reported on the work of the special committee. She noted that *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995* gives Senate purview over the non-academic student misconduct regulations; and gives the president authority to suspend any student to protect the student, other students and/or property.

Dr. McDougall explained that a special committee was formed by Senate to review the regulations and amend the provisions regarding presidential suspensions, as they were not fully aligned with the Act. The committee worked to clarify what happens regarding the decision that the president makes when suspending a student and the process to appeal a presidential suspension. These were complex issues – so a chart was developed to assist in explaining the process. The committee also took the opportunity to update the regulations and correct errors in the previous version. Dr. McDougall noted that the revised regulations were in the meeting materials and before Senate for approval. She commented that she hoped to be able to bring information to Senate's spring meeting about a guide for hearing and appeal boards when the matter involved any form of sexual misconduct.

A Senator suggested that the regulations should explicitly include a student's right to appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench and that students should receive support from an ombudsman office. Dr. McDougall advised that students were always permitted to take matters of discipline beyond the university to the courts, but that the appropriateness of embedding such right in the document would be explored. She also advised that she was exploring the role of ombudsperson with the VP Academics of the USSU and the GSA; however, this position would play a neutral role and it was unlikely the office would assist a student in preparing a legal appeal as they would not be the student's advocate. The Senator recommended that an advocate be provided for students, especially in serious discipline matters. Dr. McDougall advised that presidential suspensions were uncommon and only occurred when there was a risk to campus and the individual.

A Senator asked whether Senate members serving on hearing boards were protected from litigation, to which the university secretary replied that hearing board members and the hearing board chair were not personally exposed to liability.

A Senator asked why there was a 15-day period to be heard by the president for presidential suspensions as it seemed quite long, and it was explained that this period was in the Act.

A Senator suggested that past edits of the document be included in the editions so the history was not erased, and the response was that this suggestion would be referred to the university secretary for consideration.

BRAND/QUAN: That Senate approve the revisions to the *Standard of Student Conduct in Non-Academic Matters and Regulations and Procedures for Resolution of Complaints and Appeals* as provided, effective January 1, 2017.

CARRIED

#### Recognition and Thanks to Chancellor Blaine Favel

On behalf of Senate, President Stoicheff thanked Chancellor Favel for his fine role as chancellor and announced that there would be a special event in December to thank Chancellor Favel formally [*Secretary's note: this event was postponed and held on March 7, 2017*].

The president noted that the U of S is one of the leaders in terms of Indigenous engagement and in taking the seriousness of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee's calls to action to heart and this would not have been done so successfully without Chancellor Favel. The president also advised that Chancellor Favel has made it possible for the president to transition smoothly into his role and to see what this university could do. The president's comments were met with applause and a standing ovation for the Chancellor.

Chancellor Favel replied that it had been a great experience for him. He then thanked everyone and gave credit to the Senators for their support for the university. The Chancellor stated that he had full confidence that the Indigenous agenda of the university and the Indigenous agendas coming from the colleges will be fulfilled. He noted that Roy Romanow will be a great chancellor, and recognized he had a great precedent in Vera Pezer.

Senate recessed at 12:15 pm for lunch and reconvened at 1:15 pm.

#### 12. Senate Education Topic – Student Mental Health

Lenore Swystun, chair of the Senate education committee, introduced the topic of student mental health; and noted that today's discussion allowed Senate to move a part of the deliberative dialogue at the university. She invited Patti McDougall, vice-provost, teaching and learning to speak.

Dr. McDougall first spoke briefly about the next phase of implementation of the Sexual Assault Prevention Policy – that of training and education. She noted that there had been several ongoing activities including the Sexual Assault Awareness Week brought with the USSU; the launching of a safety app; and the launching of the React to Sexual Assault campaign. Dr. McDougall showed a two-minute React to Sexual Assault video and advised that the university was actively working training and education and would not hide anything, or sweep anything under the carpet.

Dr. McDougall then acknowledged several individuals working together on mental health at the university and invited Dr. Fern Stockdale Winder, a clinical psychologist and expert in mental health, to speak about Mental Health and Addictions.

Dr. Stockdale Winder explained that one in five people in any given year would be affected by mental health and 40% of Canadians would experience some type of mental health issue in their lifetime. Responding early was important, especially with the college population in the 18 to 24 age range. In terms of how well we were meeting the need in Canada – in 2012, of the 17.4% Canadians indicating they had a need of mental health care 11.6% felt their needs were being met, 3.7% partially met and 2.1% not met. That prevalence had not changed substantially over the past ten years, and as an example Dr. Stockdale Winder noted that Ryerson saw a 200% increase in student demand in this area.

Dr. Stockdale Winder advised that funding remained problematic in Canada, and although we were setting an unwavering call for a solid investment in mental health Canada remained the lowest funder of mental health of developed countries. She explained that reducing the associated stigma and increasing awareness were some ways to arrive at a solution. We need continued advocacy for adequate funding for mental health or addiction issues.

Dr. Stockdale Winder explained that she developed a mental health and addictions action plan for Saskatchewan. The top priority for improvement was greater access especially for children and youth. Supportive housing, early intervention and prevention priorities, and First Nation and Métis peoples' wellness were also key; as was knowledge of the available services.

Regarding college populations – Dr. Stockdale Winder advised that the focus was more on emerging adults, although mature adults and international students also had unique needs. There was greater incidence of mental health and addiction issues in 15 to 24-years old compared to the general population. Dr. Stockdale Winder provided comparable data on Canadians in 2016, U of S students in 2016, and U of S students in 2013 — that showed an increase from 2013 to 2016 of those who felt so depressed it was difficult to function; felt overwhelming anxiety; seriously considered suicide; and attempted suicide. She also provided statistics on the increased demand for services at the U of S and when alcohol was added there were more concerns. Regarding workplaces, Dr. Stockdale Winder advised that approximately 30% of disability claims were related to mental health which was a growing concern for employers and employees.

Regarding work being done at the university, Dr. McDougall reported that an Alcohol Policy was being developed this year, and every three years a student survey was conducted and benchmarked against NCHA data. The U of S student mental health diagnoses chart showed an increasing number of students presenting with anxiety, depression and ADHD which may be due to: the removal of stigma so more people coming forward; increased complex pressure on students (i.e. not uncommon for graduate students to arrive with families); and increased enrolment resulting in a higher rate of people requiring support. There were many areas in the university working on mental health on the student side with 75 activities and resources being provided on campus through eight core units.

Regarding faculty and staff, Dr. McDougall reported that mental health was the top issue affecting faculty and staff at the U of S. It is the top presenting issue for long term disability; central nervous system prescriptions represent the top disease classification by number of claims for U of S employees; and the top issues that present were about anxiety, relationships, depression and psychological-related disorders. There were several units supporting faculty and staff, through various activities.

Dr. McDougall noted that although there was considerable activity going on – administration was not satisfied given the significance of the challenge the university community was facing. Therefore, she had joined forces with the AVP HR to form a wellness partnership. This was supported by a Wellness Strategy Team, a Wellness Leadership/Advisory Team and a wellness network all around campus. The major goal was to develop an overall wellness framework for mind, body and life. An external consultant had been hired to direct the process, and with the input of university personnel they were already seeing great returns.

A Senator asked if it would be appropriate to seek advice and counsel from recovering alcoholics and those with mental health issues; which Dr. McDougall agreed to do.

The plenary was then divided into discussion groups facilitated by appointed Senators. The following questions were discussed, and all of the input from the groups was collected and posted on the university secretary's website at <http://www.usask.ca/secretariat/governing-bodies/senate/Senate%20break%20out%20notes%20October%202016.pdf>:

1. What, if anything, surprised you about the presentation we just received from Dr. Fern Stockdale-Winder? Were there things on the broader mental health landscape that you weren't aware of?
  2. What advice would you give to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and the Associate Vice-President of Human Resources (and their teams) as they lead the development of a Mental Health Strategy for the whole university?
  3. What obstacles/difficulties do you foresee in terms of implementing a mental health strategy (and related plans and tactics) for students and employees? What do you recommend to overcome these issues?
  4. Based on the current U of S inventory of resources to support student and employee mental health, where might there be gaps in resources? What resources would fill those gaps?
  5. On the reverse of this page we have an example of a schematic that we're considering as we move forward with an overall wellness framework (including mental health). If time permits, have a look at this image and provide any comments you have about how it appears to you.
13. Presentation

#### 13.1 Library Transformation Project

Charlene Sorenson, interim dean, University Library, reported on why the library needed to transform its library spaces and how this would be achieved; and provided information on university archives.

Ms. Sorenson advised that changes in demands had dramatically changed how libraries were used by faculty and students. Students were not only studying by themselves – but also in small groups and large groups; research was shared in website and blogs – not just through books and articles; and through experiential learning, blended learning and distributed learning we were moving to different ways to bring forward information. The need for capital change and reconfiguration at the U of S had been recognized since the first integrated plan, and had been ongoing since 2003. The first two phases focused on the Murray Library and Phase 3 was now looking at all libraries across campus.



There was a high-level vision document of the architectural plan and space development of the library, and Ms. Sorenson provided pictures of the changes over the past ten years that illustrated the Murray Building's main floor transformation to a vibrant space including service desk, study space, group study spaces and food.

Ms. Sorenson explained that a major goal was to provide better facilities for University Archives and Special Collections. In 2011, the responsibility for the John Diefenbaker archival materials was transferred to the university, so as part of the library transformation the Diefenbaker collection was being moved to the library to make room for other work in the Diefenbaker Centre. Provincial Archives was also located on campus – although it is a separate archive with its own mandate. There was some overlap so the university tried to direct donors to the most appropriate archive for their collections.

Ms. Sorenson advised that they needed a master plan for library spaces before transformation could happen, and it was being developed based on the 2013 plan. Extensive consultation with faculty, staff and students began in spring and was wrapping up this month. She anticipated having the master plan in December and being able to share it with the community.

To achieve the vision and with a decreased demand for print collections – more materials were being placed in storage, duplicate materials were being withdrawn from the collection as appropriate (they would be able to identify and retain multiple copies of high-use materials and few copies of low-use materials; and work with a network of libraries), and compact mobile shelving would be used in publicly accessible areas. These changes would result in more available space in the general-purpose space on campus.

Ms. Sorenson shared some of the master plan themes heard so far:

- desire for quiet space and/or privacy cubicles – that were not too isolated
- bookable study rooms with monitors and writable wall surfaces
- enhanced technology, but meaningful integration of that technology
- regarding wellness, suggestions focused on ergonomic furniture, nap areas, and green spaces
- students expressed a desire for both tangible books and digital materials.

Ms. Sorenson invited Senate members to provide feedback on the transformation project by contacting her by email or leaving comments on the circulated website.

A Senator noted that he had visited 30 archives and commended the U of S for having the best archival staff he had ever worked with. He also noted his worry about donations to the library and hoped that all faculty at the university may in some way include work in the archives as part of course work.

#### 14. Items for Information

Elizabeth Williamson, university secretary, presented the following three information items to Senate.

##### 14.1 Report on Non-academic Student Discipline for 2015/16

The university secretary explained that last year there was a request for more detailed information in this report, including trends and developments, which she attempted to

provide; however, she was limited due to small numbers in the data and the need to keep information confidential.

Ms. Williamson referred to the report in the written materials. She noted that a few years ago, residence services implemented a written disciplinary process that was built on phased disciplinary steps; whereas these complaints would have come through the non-academic discipline process they are now managed at the residence level more efficiently. Secondly, she advised that she recommended the alternate dispute resolution (ADR) process whenever circumstances were appropriate as this allowed the parties to be more collaborative in the sanctions brought forward. Thirdly, as part of implementation and training on the Sexual Assault Prevention Policy the university was encouraging more students to speak out and report sexual assaults so the number of complaints was expected to increase.

#### 14.2 Policy Oversight Committee Annual Report 2015/16

The university secretary referred to the annual report in the written materials on university policies that were adopted or amended between July 2015 and June 2016.

In response to a question about the Procurement Policy, Ms. Williamson advised that the procurement group worked to update and combine their policies this year being respectful of provincial laws and when a formal *request for proposal* process was required.

A Senator asked that the amendments to the Conflict of Interest Policy be brought to Senate for approval. Ms. Williamson noted that the Conflict of Interest Policy was identified as a policy that should be updated, although no amendments had been recommended to date. After the Vision/Mission/Values document was approved, the plan is to work on a document about standards of conduct and to the extent it applied to Senators it would come to Senate for approval. The intent was to work on the Conflict of Interest Policy after that. The Senator suggested that the Conflict of Interest Policy should extend beyond monetary matters and include a disclosure requirement. Ms. Williamson asked the Senator to send her comments directly to the university secretary's office.

#### 14.3 Senate Elections – Nominations Open

The university secretary advised that elections would be held this year for five Senate member-at-large positions and nominations would close March 1, 2017. She named the incumbent Senators whose terms were ending and were eligible to run again and advised that no district positions were up for election this year. Ms. Williamson encouraged eligible Senators to seek re-election and to encourage other alumni to run, noting that nomination forms were available on the university secretary's website.

### 15. Other Business

The university secretary advised that she had been asked to send a request to all Senators seeking their permission to share their contact information with other Senators. This request would be sent out shortly.

#### 16. Question Period

A Senator asked for clarification as to when business arising from the minutes should be raised to which Chancellor Favel advised when the minutes were being reviewed and approved.

A Senator asked whether an excerpt of Procedures for Meetings and Organizations, Third Edition by M.K. Kerr and H.W. King would be circulated as indicated at the last Senate meeting, to which the university secretary advised that she looked into this and learned that it would breach copyright laws to circulate the intended excerpt to all of Senate so this was not done; however, there were copies in the office of the university secretary which Senators could borrow. Another Senator advised that copies of Kerr and King were also available from Carswell and used copies were available from Amazon.

#### 17. Adjournment

Chancellor Favel thanked Senate noting the dates of future Convocation and Senate meetings as set out on the agenda. He expressed his enjoyment with the day and the pleasure he has had working with Senate noting that he had tried his best in his service as chancellor.

The Senate meeting was adjourned by motion.

D'EON/QUAN: Moved adjournment at 2:50 pm. CARRIED

# Senate Attendance October 15, 2016

## APPENDIX A

| APPOINTED MEMBERS         |   | DISTRICT MEMBERSHIP             |   | EX-OFFICIO            |   |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| Acton, Pamela             | R | Adam, Allan                     | R | Atkinson, Michael     | P |
| Alexander, Jeanne         | P | Binnie, Sarah                   | P | Baxter-Jones, Adam    | P |
| Baker, Carey              | P | Hall, Lee                       | R | Bergstrom, Don        | P |
| Braaten, Lee              | P | Hoback, Jerri                   | P | Bonham-Smith, Peta    | P |
| Brandt, Arlene            | P | Gough, Rhonda                   | P | Calvert, Lorne        | P |
| Browning, Lynda           | P | Kopp-McKay, Adelle              | P | Chad, Karen           | P |
| Christensen, Helen        | P | McLeod, Tenielle                | P | Downey, Terrence      | P |
| Danyliw, Adrienne         | P | McPherson, Russ                 | P | Eyre, Bronwyn         | R |
| de la Gorgendiere, Marcel | P | Michalenko, Richard             | P | Favel, Blaine         | P |
| Enoch, Simon              | A | Mitten, Rae                     | P | Fowler, Greg          | R |
| Ferhatoglu, Yurda         | P | Nicol, Jim                      | P | Freeman, Douglas      | R |
| Forbes, Richard           | P | Pulfer, Jim                     | P | Germida, Jim          | R |
| Fyfe, Ryan                | P | Smuk, Shawna                    | P | Greenberg, Louise     | R |
| Gable, Kathleen           | P | Stevenson, Corinna              | R | Harasmychuk, Robert   | R |
| Garven, Stuart            | P | <b>ELECTED MEMBERS-AT-LARGE</b> |   | Horsburgh, Beth       | R |
| Gjetvaj, Branimir         | R | Antony, Jenalene                | P | Isinger, Russell      | P |
| Greschner, Toby           | R | Bentham, Davida                 | P | Luke, Iain            | R |
| Harvey, Eileen Mae        | P | Berg, Susanne                   | P | Martini, Jeromey      | A |
| Hollick, Barry            | P | Cole, Evan                      | P | Martz, Diane          | A |
| Hrudka, Christine         | R | Gullickson, Gary                | P | McCaffrey, Geordy     | A |
| Hryniw, Crandall          | P | Howie, Leah                     | P | McDougall, Patti      | P |
| Hubich, Larry             | P | Hunter, Rylund                  | P | McKercher, Peggy      | R |
| Isinger, Lori             | R | Mihalicz, Deborah               | P | Molloy, Tom           | R |
| Kreuger, Monica           | P | Rempel, Richard                 | P | Nel, Michael          | R |
| Lanigan, Dennis           | P | Sambasivam, Chandran (Bud)      | P | Pawelke, Michael      | A |
| Lavoie, Armand            | P | Swystun, Lenore                 | P | Pezer, Vera           | P |
| Lee, Bryan                | P | Thompson, Michelle              | P | Phillipson, Martin    | R |
| MacArthur, Sandra         | P | Wells, Joyce                    | P | Pozega Osburn, Debra  | P |
| MacMillan, Judy           | R | Wesolowski, Christine           | P | Prytula, Michelle     | P |
| Martin, Stephanie         | R | <b>STUDENTS</b>                 |   | Rodgers, Carol        | R |
| Menzies, Craig            | P | Abueidda, Ahmed                 | P | Smith, Preston        | P |
| Miller, Lukas             | P | D'Eon, David                    | P | Sorenson, Charlene    | P |
| Morrison, Karen           | P | Ghaith, Ziad, GSA               | P | Stoicheff, Peter      | P |
| Mushinski, Valerie        | P | Quan, Jessica                   | P | Tyler, Robert         | P |
| Neufeldt, Victoria        | P | Sieffert, Jon                   | P | Turner, Ted           | R |
| Olfert, Charles           | P | Brand, Joshua                   | P | Uswak, Gerry          | R |
| Olfert, Ernest            | P | TBA                             |   | Wasan, Kishor         | R |
| Orr, Mary                 | P | <b>P=present</b>                |   | Willoughby, Keith     | P |
| Prisciak, Karen           | p | <b>R=regrets</b>                |   | <b>NON-VOTING</b>     |   |
| Prokopchuk, Nadia         | P | <b>A=absent</b>                 |   | Williamson, Elizabeth | P |
| Stavness, Carrie          | P |                                 |   |                       |   |
| Thibodeau, Lisa           | P |                                 |   |                       |   |
| Toye, Colleen             | P |                                 |   |                       |   |
| Wiens, Rod                | P |                                 |   |                       |   |
| Yee, Tim                  | P |                                 |   |                       |   |

## President's Report to Senate – April 2017



### Welcoming New Senior Leadership

*Chancellor Roy Romanow*

I want to welcome The Honorable Roy Romanow to his first University Senate meeting as the University of Saskatchewan's 15<sup>th</sup> Chancellor. By virtue of his position, he is also the chair of Senate and we couldn't ask for a better governance expert for the role.

*Dr. Tony Vannelli, Provost and Vice-President Academic*

On Jan. 23<sup>rd</sup>, I was happy to announce Dr. Tony Vannelli as our new provost and vice-president academic. Dr. Vannelli joins us after completing two terms as dean of the College of Physical and Engineering Sciences at the University of Guelph. He has also held faculty and administrative positions at the University of Toronto and the University of Waterloo.

Although Dr. Vannelli will start his 5-year term on August 1<sup>st</sup>, he has agreed to visit the U of S over the next few months to begin his transition. Dr. Vannelli replaces interim provost Michael Atkinson, who has our gratitude for stepping into the interim role last October.



*Connectivity*

### Memorandum of Understanding with the Saskatoon Symphony Orchestra

On January 28<sup>th</sup> I publicly signed a first-of-a-kind memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the U of S and the Saskatoon Symphony Orchestra. In addition to connections we have enjoyed with the SSO for several decades, the MOU prepares the way for artist-in-residence programs, a formal relationship with the SSO artistic director, the potential to collaborate on the instrument collections we are fortunate to have such as the Amati Instruments and the David Kaplan international and Indigenous collection, e-lectures and other initiatives.

### Memorandum of Understanding with the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations

In early February, the University of Saskatchewan and the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations (FSIN) signed its first memorandum of understanding (MOU). The agreement builds on our relationship with the FSIN to increase our collaborative efforts, to more effectively work

with First Nations in Saskatchewan and improve educational outcomes for First Nations students.

The work outlined in the MOU will be shaped and developed by engagement and dialogue between the FSIN and the university. We are committed to engaging in regular dialogue to facilitate the achievement of shared initiatives and to formally entrench the opportunity for reciprocal presentations on our respective work. We also commit to form working groups or other mechanisms as needed to focus on particular issues that are of mutual concern and facilitate joint action on areas and projects of interest.

I see this MoU as a fine example of formal relationships we can build with many Indigenous communities in and beyond the province.

### U of S to host *One Health* conference

Led by the University of Saskatchewan, the City of Saskatoon has won the bid to host the 2018 International One Health Congress, an event that is expected to bring more than 1,000 researchers and health professionals from around the world to share their work and create new research collaborations.

The 2018 congress will be held June 21 to 25 at TCU Place and on the U of S campus. Saskatoon will be the first North American city to host the congress that began in 2011. Previous conferences have taken place in Amsterdam and Bangkok. The U of S was selected by the international One Health Platform leadership team to co-host the meeting because the university has made One Health a research priority, with internationally acclaimed undergraduate, graduate, and faculty training and research programs. The impact of hosting 1,000 world leaders in health sciences for four days will be significant for Saskatoon, and an opportunity to position our city as a leader in this important new field internationally.

Our *One Health* initiatives at the U of S are built on the premise that the health of people, animals and the environment are connected. Such health problems are complex, and we need expertise from all disciplines to understand and collaboratively solve them. This conference will bring together scientists, health care professionals, educators and members of the community, as well as people responsible for making government policy, to share their points of view and better understand each other's priorities and needs.

The conference theme will be *One Health in Underserved Communities*, focusing on underprivileged or subsistent communities where there's a complex interplay of environmental, animal and human health issues, including the spread of infectious diseases,

foodborne disease outbreaks, sick livestock and companion animals, and chronic water shortages.

## Prime Minister Trudeau's Town Hall at the U of S

The Prime Minister held a well-attended town hall in Saskatoon on the U of S campus on the evening of January 25<sup>th</sup>. Many students, faculty, staff and members of the Saskatoon community were in attendance. I was pleased that our university was chosen by the prime minister's office as the venue for the event. It provided an opportunity for Prime Minister Trudeau to get a sense of our university and its priorities, and to be introduced by one of our alumni, Minister Ralph Goodale.

## Appointment from Universities Canada

I now chair the Education Committee of Universities Canada. The mandate of the committee is to maintain a key understanding of federal developments that impact funding and the educational mission of Canada's universities. This year's focus for the committee will be on how Canada's universities can meet our commitments to Indigenous peoples and to champion equity and diversity for Universities Canada.

This posting is a two-year term and will connect me with presidents from across Canada, keeping the U of S at the forefront of national post-secondary issues.



## Reaction and Response to Immigration issues in the US

On Sunday, January 29<sup>th</sup>, after the first American executive order regarding immigration bans was signed, I posted the following message on the University's website:

*The University of Saskatchewan expresses its deep concern regarding the American presidential order which bans the immigration of citizens and refugees from certain countries to the U.S. We affirm the values of diversity, inclusion and respect asserted in our mission statement. Along with Universities Canada and the Association of American Universities, the U of S calls for this ban to end as quickly as possible.*

*The executive order has the potential to negatively affect our research and teaching partnerships with U.S. institutions, conference participation, study abroad, and interactions with U.S. colleagues with common academic interests. We are working at*

*our globally- connected university to understand the full impact the executive order will have on our students, faculty and staff. We will keep our community informed as our analysis continues.*

*Universities such as ours play a critical role in advancing a civil society, and in attracting international talent to Canada. We will remain, as our mission statement asserts, “an innovative, accessible, and welcoming place for students, educators, and researchers from around the world.”*

Although there was some disruption to travel efforts within our community at the time, they did appear to be minimal. Since that time, we’ve seen new versions of this ban come forward. We will be watching closely to minimize any impacts these bans may have on our students, faculty, staff and partners. An example is that we have waived the graduate application fees for students from identified countries.

### Internal Reconciliation Forum

On March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017 we held our second forum on reconciliation at the U of S. While the first forum was about bringing university and Indigenous leaders from across Canada to campus, this forum focused on the contributions that we will be making at the U of S, and by the U of S, in response to the national reconciliation challenge.

There is a significant amount of work to do, and our university, situated in Saskatchewan as it is, has an opportunity for tremendous growth in this area. As we continue on this journey of reconciliation, I am seeing a great sense of hope and of potential for change among our faculty, students and staff and look forward to building upon that at our forum.

It is important to note that the U of S already has a lengthy list of Indigenous initiatives, academic programs and services across campus that aim to close the education gap. That is particularly important because we have one of the largest Aboriginal student populations in the country, with at least 2,500 First Nations, Métis, and Inuit students currently enrolled.

### Adoption of Aboriginal Acknowledgement

As Council had done last year, the University of Saskatchewan Board of Governors now officially opens all of its board and committee meetings with the same acknowledgment:

*“As we gather here today, we acknowledge we are on Treaty 6 Territory and the Homeland of the Métis. We pay our respect to the First Nation and Métis ancestors of this place and reaffirm our relationship with one another.”*



For those new to Senate, this wording, which is identical to the wording used by Council, was developed by our own Teaching, Learning, and Academic Resources Committee (TLARC) of council. TLARC consulted broadly with members of the Indigenous community of campus and those most connected with Indigenous programming.

### Historic Donation of Inuit Art

Norman Zepp (BA'76) and his wife Judith Varga (BA'76) donated over 200 sculptures, dozens of prints and drawings, five wall hangings, a vast set of photographs and original interviews with the Inuit artists—predominantly from the Keewatin region of Nunavut.

I am told that this would be a remarkable collection even if the art weren't included. The interviews and archival material provide unique insight into the lives of Canada's northern artists—indeed it is likely the only in-depth documentation available about many of the artists. This is an invaluable addition to our research collections focusing on the North.

### International Profile

The U of S was profiled in *The Atlantic* recently for its successful commitment to Indigenous engagement. Speaking with a number of key administrators and with student leaders, the story dug deep into the many initiatives offered on campus (such as the Aboriginal Student Achievement Program and the Gordon Oakes Red Bear Student Centre). Additionally, the article posited whether similar post-secondary supports in the United States could have similar success.



### Provincial Budget

The provincial budget was released on March 22<sup>nd</sup> of this year and it included a 5.6 per cent budget reduction – the largest percentage decrease in the university's history.

Although we had been preparing for a substantial budget reduction for many weeks, the budget is deeply troubling to the U of S, and to the people we serve throughout Saskatchewan. The people of this province deserve to have one of Canada's top universities, and we will not be deterred by this budget; we are determined, as a community, that it will neither define us nor diminish us. As we have always done during our 110-year history, we will find a way to provide what our province needs.

We are bolstered by the fact that we are one of the best financially managed universities in Canada, but these reductions will deplete the university's reserves and weaken our ability to

serve the province. This will be damaging, but we will manage the potential impacts this has on our campus community—our students, faculty and staff.

Investment in education and our students is one of the most critical areas for the province to support as it plans for a strong future. We are disappointed and troubled by the signal this budget sends. Our university is a major economic driver in Saskatchewan and contributes more economic benefit to its region than almost any other university in the entire country. In 2014, about \$1.2 billion of Saskatchewan’s economy was tied to the U of S. Continued reductions to our university will jeopardize the long-term economic future of our province.

As a steward of taxpayers’ money, the university has always been committed to using its resources strategically and carefully to continue building on the important work critical to the province and its people in areas such as human, animal and environmental health, food and water security, agriculture, the arts and Indigenous engagement.

As we begin to analyze and contemplate the impact this budget has for our future, I look forward to working with our senators to ensure our government officials are fully aware of the contributions the university has made to the province of Saskatchewan, and beyond.

### Research Centres Awarded Federal Funding to Advance Innovation

In January, Canada’s Science Minister, Kirsty Duncan, announced that \$328 million will be invested through the Major Science Initiatives (MSI) fund of the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) to support research operations across Canada – including three centres at the U of S:

- \$48 million for the Canadian Light Source (CLS) which is supporting ground-breaking research in health, the environment, materials and agriculture including unique work done in biomedical imaging and therapy that holds promise in areas such as advancing cancer therapy and treating osteoporosis;
- \$19.3 million for the [International Vaccine Centre](#) (InterVac) part of the [Vaccine and Infectious Disease Organization](#) (VIDO) which is one of the largest, most advanced containment level 3 facilities in the world and provides the infrastructure to safely study infectious diseases of animals and humans and develop vaccines to protect against these emerging health threats; and
- \$1.56 million for [SuperDARN](#) Canada, a U of S-led initiative operating five radar arrays across Canada that provide continuous mapping of “space weather” above Canada, data critical to being able to predict when electromagnetic storms above Earth could threaten technologies such as GPS, electrical grids and navigation systems.

## New \$8.4 million Saskatchewan MS research chair announced at U of S

A new \$8.4-million U of S Chair in Multiple Sclerosis Clinical Research will lead a drive toward a cure for multiple sclerosis (MS), a debilitating disease of the central nervous system. Rates of MS are among the highest in the world in Saskatchewan where 3,500 to 3,700 residents live with the disease.

Dr. Michael Levin, neurologist and professor at the College of Medicine at the University of Tennessee Health Science Center, and Director of the Multiple Sclerosis Center and Laboratory of Viral and Demyelinating Diseases, in Memphis, Tennessee, will lead a team of researchers, clinicians and students during a seven-year term, starting March 2017. The team includes Dr. Katherine Knox, whose research focuses on MS and mobility, and Dr. Valerie Verge, director of the Cameco Neuroscience Research Centre, whose research focuses on nerve injury and repair mechanisms.

Support for the chair is provided by the Saskatoon City Hospital Foundation, the Saskatchewan Health Research Foundation, the MS Society of Canada and the U of S Centennial Enhancement Chair program, as well as the U of S College of Medicine and the Saskatoon Health Region.

## Upgrade to National Sustainability Ranking

The U of S has upgraded its Sustainability Tracking, Assessment and Ratings System (STARS) ranking from bronze to silver, a goal that has been accomplished three years ahead of the university's original target of 2020. It is worth noting that, during this assessment, we found that we are extremely close to achieving a gold ranking. With some concerted effort, it is my belief we can reach this ranking by next year's assessment.

STARS, created by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education, is a transparent, self-reporting framework used by more than 700 universities and colleges. The program measures achievement in sustainability and awards rankings, including bronze, silver, gold and platinum, based on performance metrics.

Out of the U15 universities, only eight actively participate in the STARS program, so we are among the elite who invest in this kind of public reporting and commitment to achieving sustainability outcomes.

STARS assessment relies on hundreds of sustainability indicators, ranging from energy use to student groups to sustainability research. Several new pushes in sustainability helped the university gain points toward STARS silver, including updated lighting in buildings, plumbing retrofits that save 30,000 litres of water every day in the Education building alone, as well as

the campus sustainability revolving fund, which re-invests savings accrued from environmentally-friendly endeavors to support future initiatives.



## VIDO-InterVac helping to fight Zika virus

The Zika virus outbreak in the Americas has been linked to microcephaly (incomplete brain development) in babies born to infected mothers. The virus, which is primarily spread by mosquitos, can also be sexually transmitted. Currently there is no vaccine or therapy available to combat the infection.

VIDO-InterVac is at the forefront of tackling disease at the human-animal interface, including the development of new animal models. Developing alternative animal models for emerging pathogens such as Zika virus is a crucial first step in understanding the disease and bringing new vaccines and therapies to market.

## Bringing Research ideas to the Marketplace

The Innovation Enterprise (IE) unit (formerly known as the Innovation Liaison Office) is charged with proactively turning great ideas from the U of S into commercial realities. The IE unit assists researchers by providing in-house technical, legal and financial expertise and experience to move an idea forward, possibly into a business start-up.

Innovation Enterprise uses creativity to turn knowledge into ideas – innovations and inventions into solutions, new products and services.

## *Converge 2017 Conference*

In February I represented the University of Saskatchewan at the Universities Canada event *Converge 2017*. *Converge* was an opportunity for future innovators, creators, entrepreneurs and community leaders from Canada's universities to join other leaders from across the country in Ottawa to explore what Canada can become in the next 50 years.

The conference included discussions on issues such as global migration, reconciliation, and strengthening pluralism through the arts. Conference-wide sessions focused on our next generation of innovators, entrepreneurs and community leaders.

## Canada 150 Celebrations

This year marks the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Canada’s confederation and many groups, including universities across the nation, are organizing celebrations for this landmark anniversary. Coinciding with the 110<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the U of S and the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the U of S Alumni Association, the U of S celebrations will highlight past and present achievements of U of S graduates, celebrate research and innovation contributions to Canada, and engage with our community to imagine how the U of S will continue to contribute to Canada’s future.

From new scholarships and initiatives to cultural celebrations, anniversaries and on-campus discussions with former prime ministers, the U of S Canada 150 initiative will underscore three key university themes—diversity, connectivity and sustainability. A suite of scholarships will provide new opportunities for U of S students to study abroad and for inbound international undergraduate students to study here. In support of student artistic work, a three-movement work entitled *Scenes of Plains Peoples* has been commissioned for performance by the U of S Greystone Singers, the jazz ensemble, and the wind orchestras. The U of S has partnered with Indspire, an Indigenous-led organization that seeks long-term growth in Aboriginal education, to bring its Cross Canada Youth Laureate Tour to campus on May 30. The event will feature a panel discussion in which local Indspire Awards laureates will engage in dialogue with students, educators, parents and the community about the importance of education.

Special events planned for the fall include a visit by former Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien—co-ordinated by U of S Chancellor Roy Romanow—to take part in a public discussion on Canada’s future, as well as a panel discussion on the future of Canadian health care.

Nominations are now being accepted for deserving faculty, staff, students and alumni for the Canada 150 Citizen campaign which recognizes individuals who are helping to make Canada a more diverse, inclusive and environmentally sustainable country. A new category — “Making a Difference Video Competition” — has been added to the Images of Research competition, offering researchers a chance to tell in 60 seconds the story of their research and how it benefits the country. University Archives has selected 150 photographs to pay tribute to the university’s past, while a new video will highlight new work in our signature areas of research.

Visit [canada150.usask.ca](http://canada150.usask.ca) for more information and ways to get involved.





**University of Saskatchewan - Graduate Students' Association**

**GSA President's report**

**GSA Executive team 2016/17**

**GSA President:** Ziad Ghaith

**Vice President Operations and Communications:** Nafisa Absher

**Vice President Student Affairs:** Shailza Sapal

**Vice President External:** Carolyn Gasper

**Vice President Academic:** Ali Kiani

**Vice President Finance:** Kusum Sharma

**Aboriginal Liaison:** Iloradanon Efimoff

**GSA staff 2016/17**

**Office Manager:** Sherri-Lyn Rohovich

Dear Senate members:

On behalf of the GSA executives and staff, it is my great pleasure to provide to you my second report on the GSA activities and initiative for this academic year. The GSA had a very successful year in terms of advocating for graduate students' strategic needs internally and externally. In cooperating with other student bodies, and raising awareness for the need of better engagement and representation of graduate students in terms of decision making at the University of Saskatchewan. Working together for the ultimate benefit of our university as the only research intensive university in Saskatchewan.

This report is divided into 4 major sections. The first section highlights the GSA strategic initiatives, the section, illustrates the GSA internal changes and improvements, and the third section discusses the GSA new services for graduate students. The final section focusses on the GSA work with the Association of Graduate Employees at the University of Saskatchewan.



## **1. GSA strategic initiatives**

### **1.1 Graduate Students representation**

In the Senate October report, the GSA informed the Senate members that the graduate students are undertaking an important project to improve their representation on the University Board of Governance, council, and senate. This project has been developing slowly, although some progress has been achieved. The GSA has sent a proposal to the Senate Membership Committee to increase the number of graduate students on senate, and a similar request was sent to the University President and Provost regarding graduate students representation on the University Board of Governance. We graduate students at the University of Saskatchewan are deeply concerned about their representation, and we hope that our university will help its graduate students in finding a resolution for their important concerns.

### **1.2 Students Supervisor Guideline**

The GSA has been working over the last two terms to draft a Student-Supervisor Guideline, where we seek to implement a mandatory signed guideline between supervisors and their students as the students commence work on their research. The GSA formed an ad-hoc committee to draft a guideline, where the committee has reviewed similar works in other Canadian universities, and has run several consultation meetings with graduate students, the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, faculty members and graduate chairs in different academic units.

The final draft (from GSA) has been recently submitted to the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for their committees to review and discuss the potential implementation within the college, while the consultation is ongoing in parallel to continue improving the proposed document.

## **2. Graduate Students' Association Governance and Internal improvement**

The GSA has recently approved a new governance structure including creating a new governance body (board of directors) and combining four executive roles into two positions. The new governance structure of the GSA includes:

- Separating GSA Council/Board
- Merging 4 executive positions into two: VP Operations and Finance in one position, and VP Student Affairs and Academic in one position.
- Hiring a book keeper.

The goal of these changes are to ensure the consistency in the GSA in terms of long term planning, and to ensure the GSA consistency in advocating for the graduate students internal and external priorities. Also, as part of the internal improvement, the historical audits of the GSA have been undertaken, with significant support from the university and the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies with an expectation to finish by this summer.

Further to these changes, the GSA will start drafting a strategic five years plan to ensure that the GSA will continue addressing important issues for the graduate students.

## **3. Graduate Students' Association Services and Events**

### **3.1. Services**

The GSA has continued to provide its traditional services to more than 4000 graduate students, these services include the health and dental plan, UPASS and student bursaries. This year the GSA has introduced a variety of new services which include: notary service, crisis aid program, Campus legal Service and Tax filing.

### 3.2. GSA Events

The GSA has organized (and will organize over April) several events and these include:

- Graduate achievement week to celebrate the achievements of its members from March 28-April 1st. The GSA Achievement week is an annual week organized by the GSA and dedicated to celebrate and appreciate the academic and leadership achievements of the graduate students at the University of Saskatchewan. This year, the GSA is organizing the local 3 Minutes Thesis (3MT) and academic conference in cooperation with the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies on March 29-31. Graduate Students from all departments have submitted their abstracts to participate in the 3MT to showcase their innovative research work being done at the University of Saskatchewan in a 3-minute showdown of straightforward yet sophisticated speeches at the 3-Minute competition. The achievement week will be followed with a grand celebration on April 1st, 2017 where the GSA will hold its prestigious annual Awards Gala to appreciate the research, teaching and leadership achievements of the graduate students and faculty members. For the first time the GSA will host the regional 3MT organized by the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, where the winners in different local 3MT in the Western Canadian University will be participating in the regional competition.
- ThinkGRAD: ThinkGRAD is a graduate student think tank; an official group of Graduate Student Association's (GSA) from all universities in Canada focused on graduate research and development. This group of graduate student leaders will meet for the first time in our University to discuss content regarding graduate student issues, best practices and will provide overall support for graduate student life across Canada. The outcome of this think tank was not to infringe on the governing practices of each GSA but rather supplement efforts, provide input and be the voice of graduate students from across Canada. Each year, a discussion on graduate

student themed concerns occurred and best practices were shared to strengthen GSA's across Canada. It was clear that this think tank was the next step in allowing GSA's from coast-to-coast to communicate with each other.

On April 18-21, 2017, the University of Saskatchewan GSA will host for the first time, ThinkGRAD. We welcome this as an opportunity to strengthen our ties with other GSA's across Canada, to learn from other graduate student leaders from across Canada and to voice the concerns of graduate students from the University of Saskatchewan. No doubt, this conference will provide us with an opportunity to discuss issues of utmost importance such as indigenization across Canada, student-supervisor relationships and university administration-GSA relations. Being the host of this conference, we plan on obtaining every opportunity to examine areas of concern that our graduate students are facing.

#### **4. GSA work with USask Association of Graduate Employees**

The GSA has been working with USask Association of Graduate Employees, PSAC local 40004 to address one of the major concerns of the graduate students' employees and the low wage rate (18.51/hour) which is one of the lowest graduate wage rates in the U15 and across all Canadian Universities.

Graduate student employees represent roughly half of the total population of graduate students (half of the GSA members) voted in 2015 with vast majority in favor of unionizing. The union bargaining team entered negotiations with the University in late 2015, and over the last year and a half has made good progress on every front except the most important - appointments and wages.

The GSA and USask Association of Graduate Students research shows that graduate student wages at the University of Saskatchewan are behind virtually all other unionized TAs and RAs, and in

most cases by a substantial margin. Even looking past similar-sized universities, the wage is behind the University of Regina by between 5 and 10% (they have different rates for Masters and PhD students). The union's proposal for parity with the average paid to TAs and RAs at similar-sized universities was \$24.00/hour. The GSA considers this as a fair proposal by our peers in the union. We are aware, according to our engagement with the graduate students, that the current wage is not enough to live on, nor is it a fair exchange for the work that is done considering the annual increase of tuition and life expenses. Many students struggle with finances, and we have learned of graduate students going to the food bank to support themselves. International students who represents about 38 percent of total graduate students are the most vulnerable, as they are ineligible for many scholarships and pay more in tuition fees. The GSA is working with the union to enhance the working conditions for all graduate students' employees, and we plan to strengthen our collaboration with the union over the next year to ensure that our graduate employee members have fair working conditions.





## Report from University Council

---

### FOR INFORMATION

**PRESENTED BY:** Lisa Kalynchuk, Chair, University Council

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** **Report to Senate on University Council Activities 2016/2017**

*The University of Saskatchewan Act 1995* established a representative University Council for the University of Saskatchewan, conferring on the Council responsibility and authority “for overseeing and directing the university’s academic affairs.”

The 2016-17 academic year marks the 22<sup>nd</sup> year of the representative University Council. Although academic governance at the University of Saskatchewan has matured over the past 20 years as our institution has become more complex, Council has always worked and continues to work under three **major** principles:

- First, Council has always enjoyed **academic freedom** in the past, and we continue to value it;
- Second, Council is a **collegial self-governing body** and we have responsibilities to govern ourselves accordingly;
- Third, Council is the **university’s academic governance body** where academic matters are considered and decisions are made.

I am pleased to report on the activities of the Council from April 1, 2016 to March 31, 2017. Council agendas and minutes are posted at: <http://www.usask.ca/secretariat/governing-bodies/council/agendas.php>.

The following is a summary of the major items dealt with by Council over the last year:

#### University Council approvals

##### Arts and Science

- Program Terminations
  - Deletion of the Northern Studies and Public Administration fields of study for the Bachelor of Arts program

##### Education

- Changes to admissions qualifications for entry into the Bachelor of Education direct-entry, sequential, Saskatchewan Urban Native Teachers Education Program (SUNTEP), and Indian Teachers Education Program (ITEP) (*changes to direct-entry and sequential program confirmed by Senate in October 2016, confirmation of changes to SUNTEP and ITEP being requested by Senate at the April 2017 meeting*)

## Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

### New Programs

- Ph.D. in Indigenous Studies
- Addition of a project option for the Master of Science (M.Sc) in Large Animal Clinical Sciences
- Addition of a project option for the Master of Science (M.Sc) in Small Animal Clinical Sciences
- Direct-Entry Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Kinesiology (*confirmation of the 85% average as admissions requirement being requested of Senate at the April 2017 meeting*)

### Program Terminations:

- Soil Science Field of Study for the Master of Agriculture (M.Ag) and Post-graduate diploma (PGD) programs

## Law

- Introduction of a one-time 4-year Juris Doctor (JD) program in Nunavut

## Medicine

- Changes to admissions qualifications for the M.D. program to require a Diversity and Social Accountability Program (DSAAP) questionnaire (*confirmation of this change is being requested of Senate in April 2017*)

## Policy approvals

Council approved revisions to the *Nomenclature Report* to update the academic terminology employed by the university. The revised *Chairs and Professorships Policy* was also approved by Council and the Board of Governors.

## New Chairs and Professorships

Council and the Board of Governors approved the establishment of the David L. Kaplan Chair in Music.

## Reports

As well as its regular monthly reports from the president and the provost and from the University of Saskatchewan Students Union (USSU) and from the Graduate Students' Association (GSA), Council received an enrolment report and a report from the vice-president research.

The following reports were provided to the Council from its committees:

**Academic Programs Committee** (Chair: Kevin Flynn, English): As well as reviewing the program proposals and admission qualification changes listed above, the committee reviewed the Nomenclature Report, the Academic and Curricular Changes Authority chart and continued its work on the development of guidelines for the development of certificates of proficiency. The committee also reported to Council on changes in admission selection criteria approved by colleges and approved the Academic Calendar for 2017/18.



**Governance Committee** (Chair: Louise Racine, Nursing): In accordance with its role relative to University Council bylaws, regulations, rules and procedures, the governance committee focused on final revisions to Council's *Regulations on Student Academic Misconduct*, leading to approval of the regulations by Council last June. The committee is engaged in reviewing the bylaws on affiliation and federation with other educational institutes and organizations and has retained a project consultant to assist with this work. Assisting colleges and schools in either creating or revising faculty council bylaws has been a major focus of the committee this year.

**Coordinating Committee** (Chair: Lisa Kalynchuk, Medicine-Neurology): The committee met regularly to set the agenda for Council meetings and determine the disposition of motions from individual members of the Council.

**International Activities Committee** (Chairs: Hongming Cheng, Sociology and Gord Zello, Pharmacy and Nutrition): The committee received reports from several colleges highlighting their international activities to gain a better understanding of strengths, challenges, and common themes across campus and concluded their investigation of internationalization in the colleges. The committee has been focused on supporting the Office of the Vice-President Research as the *Blueprint for Internationalization* is developed. The committee has also begun to look at the role of metrics and our place in international rankings.

**Nominations Committee** (Chairs: Ed Krol, Pharmacy and Nutrition and Tamara Larre, Law): The committee made nominations to Council for membership on Council committees and other university committees, such as search and review committees for senior administrators, and committees mandated under the collective agreement related to the collegial review processes of promotion and tenure.

**Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee** (Chairs: Rainer Dick, Physics and Engineering Physics and Paul Jones, School of Environment and Sustainability): The committee submitted the university research ethics boards' annual reports and a report on policy breaches under the *Responsible Conduct of Research Policy* to Council. A working group has been struck to examine artistic discovery at the University of Saskatchewan and out role in the wider arts community. The committee also received presentations from the U of S representatives for the tri-agency research funding agencies and reviewed the *Blueprint for Internationalization* and proposals to establish a Respiratory Research Centre and a Centre for Justice Research, Evaluation and Action Towards Equal Justice (CREATE Justice)

**Planning and Priorities Committee** (Chair: Lisa Kalynchuk, Medicine-Neurology and Dirk de Boer, Geography and Planning): The committee reviewed several notices of intent to create new degree programs. Relative to its role to report on the main elements of the university's operating and capital budgets, the committee reported to Council on the annual Operations Forecast submission to the province, and provided feedback to proponents on the Recreation and Athletics Facilities Master Plan and the Library Space Plan. As part of its mandate related to academic structures, the committee presented the Department of Emergency Medicine, the Respiratory Research Centre, and the CREATE Justice Centre to Council for approval. Other topics engaging the committee include the university's resource centre management budget model, the ConnectionPoint service delivery model, tuition rates, and institutional rankings and their relevance. The committee also submitted the *Vision, Mission and Values of the University of Saskatchewan* to Council for approval.

**Scholarships and Awards Committee** (Chair: Frank Klaassen, History and Donna Goodridge, Medicine): In accordance with its mandate, the committee reviewed and authorized fund allocations for a variety of student awards, and adjudicated undergraduate awards with subjective criteria. In addition, the committee has undertaken professional development on the structure and creation of undergraduate awards, the graduate awards landscape, and award adjudication; and it is exploring development of a more formal process and rubric for subjective awards adjudication, and a process for identifying and correcting awards restricted by gender.

**Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee** (Chair: Jay Wilson, Curriculum Studies): The teaching, learning and academic resources committee has taken on the challenging role of reviewing *The Learning Charter* to ensure that it reflects the university's goals regarding meaningful learning opportunities grounded in Indigenous content and ways of knowing. This work has included reviewing current practices around Indigenous content in the schools and colleges. TLARC has also been engaged in work to raise the profile of teaching at the institution.

### **Council engagement**

This fall a planning advisory committee was established to provide guidance and feedback on the planning process for the university's next integrated plan. Serving on the committee are the chair of the Council, and the chairs of the academic programs, planning and priorities, and research, scholarly and artistic work committees. Members of the coordinating committee, comprised of the chair, vice-chair and committee chairs, also had monthly breakfast meetings with the president and vice-presidents to discuss common topics of interest.

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa Kalynchuk, Chair

## Report from University Council

---

### FOR CONFIRMATION

- PRESENTED BY:** Kevin Flynn; Chair, Academic Programs Committee of Council
- DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017
- SUBJECT:** **Change to Admissions Qualifications for the Bachelor of Education Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP) and Indian Teacher Education Program (ITEP)**
- DECISION REQUESTED:** *It is recommended*  
That Senate confirm the approval of changes to admissions qualifications for the Bachelor of Education (B. Ed.) Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP) and the Indian Teacher Education Program (ITEP), effective for students who are entering the program in or after September 2017.

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

The *University of Saskatchewan Act* states that decisions regarding admissions qualifications and enrolment quotas for university programs are to be approved by Council and confirmed by University Senate.

The College of Education has proposed changes to admissions requirements for students entering the Indian Teacher Education Program (ITEP) and Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP). For students applying directly from high school, the proposed changes allow for applicants to have deficiencies in two study areas; those deficiencies must be remediated before the student is permitted to proceed to the second year in the program. Previously, students were only permitted one deficiency in the required subject areas. The rationale for allowing deficiencies is to facilitate enrolment by students from other provinces whose graduation requirements might not align with admissions requirements to the College of Education at the University of Saskatchewan. Students entering the ITEP and SUNTEP programs with at least 18 cu of post-secondary work with a minimum average of 60% will no longer require any specific high school prerequisites.

These changes align admissions requirements for the ITEP and SUNTEP programs with the admissions requirements for the direct-entry B.Ed 4-year program.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

The Academic Programs Committee of University Council reviewed these proposed admissions changes at its February 8, 2017 meeting, and they were approved by University Council at its March 23, 2017 meeting.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Proposed changes to Admissions Requirements for the Bachelor of Education (B. Ed.) ITEP and SUNTEP programs

# MOTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FACULTY COUNCIL

Brought forward for consideration at the **December, 2016** meeting of the College of Education Faculty Council by the Undergraduate Programs Committee.

Forwarded by Dawn Wallin after consultation with Chris Scribe, Yvette Arcand, Sheila Pocha, and Sandy Sherwin-Shields.

### **PREAMBLE:**

#### **Proposed Changes to 2017-2018 Admission Requirements**

Changes to the admission qualifications are proposed for the SUNTEP and ITEP programs. These proposed changes are to align the SUNTEP and ITEP admission qualifications with the direct-entry 4-year B.Ed. program, which were approved by University Council in October 2016.

#### **Admission Qualifications Rationale:**

##### **Pre-requisites – High School**

Many students from other provinces and countries, may not be able to meet our pre-requisites due to their curricula (e.g., Alberta students; science stream vs. social science stream, etc.) and graduation standards. As such, the proposed changes to the admission qualifications include allowing for a deficiency in "History 30 or Social Studies 30 or Native Studies 30" and allowing for two deficiencies among the indicated subjects, which must be cleared (or waived) prior to entering their second year of study.

##### **Pre-requisites – Post-Secondary**

Furthermore, those students who are being admitted with 18 credit units or more of transferable post-secondary coursework, have already demonstrated their ability to succeed at the post-secondary level. Therefore, one of the proposed changes is to remove the high school pre-requisites from the Post-Secondary (upper year transfer) admission qualifications.

### **MOTIONS:**

1. To allow applicants to be deficient in the subject area of Social Sciences (i.e., History 30 or Social Studies 30 or Native Studies 30) for the ITEP and SUNTEP programs.

**Wallin/McVittie**

**Approved**

2. To accept two deficiencies for regular admissions qualifications for the ITEP and SUNTEP programs that must be cleared prior to entering second year of study.

**Wallin/Okoko**

**Approved**

3. To remove high-school pre-requisites for regular admission qualifications for the ITEP and SUNTEP programs for post-secondary students who hold 18 or more of transferable post-secondary credit units and who meet all other regular admission requirements.

**Wallin/Arcand**

**Approved**

## Proposed Changes to 2017-2018 Admission Requirements

**College: Education**

**Program(s): Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP) and Indian Teacher Education Program (ITEP)**

**Admission Qualifications:**

**SUNTEP:**

- **Regular Admission – High School (less than 18 credit units of transferable post-secondary):**
  - Grade 12 standing or equivalent.
  - Minimum average of 70% on five-subject high school average (see Admission calculation and average April, 2004).
  - Proficiency in English.
  - One prerequisite subject from each of the following subject areas\*:
    - **Natural Sciences: Biology 30 or Chemistry 30 or Physics 30 or Geology 30 or Computer Science 30**
    - **Social Sciences: History 30 or Social Studies 30 or Native Studies 30**
    - **Mathematics: Foundations of Mathematics 30 or Pre-Calculus 30**
    - **Approved Second Language or Fine/Performing Art: 30-level language (other than English) or 30-level Fine/Performing Art**

*\*An applicant is permitted to be deficient in two of these subject areas. If admitted, students must clear any deficiencies before entering the second year of study.*

- **Regular Admission – post-secondary (18 credit units of transferable post-secondary):**
  - Minimum average of 60% on 18 or more of transferable credit units from a recognized and/or accredited post-secondary institution; average calculated on all attempted courses which are transferable to the University of Saskatchewan.
  - Proficiency in English.
  - No high school prerequisites required.
- **Special (Mature) Admission:**
  - Proof of age (21 or older).
  - A written submission demonstrating capacity to undertake university-level studies.
  - Transcripts of any secondary or post-secondary coursework.
  - Less than 18 credit units of transferable post-secondary coursework.
  - Résumé.
  - Proficiency in English.

## ITEP:

- **Regular Admission – High School (less than 18-credit units of transferable post-secondary):**
    - Grade 12 standing or equivalent.
    - Minimum average of 70% on five-subject high school average (see Admission calculation and average April, 2004).
    - Proficiency in English.
    - One prerequisite subject from each of the following subject areas\*:
      - **Natural Sciences: Biology 30 or Chemistry 30 or Physics 30 or Geology 30 or Computer Science 30**
      - **Social Sciences: History 30 or Social Studies 30 or Native Studies 30**
      - **Mathematics: Foundations of Mathematics 30 or Pre-Calculus 30**
      - **Approved Second Language or Fine/Performing Art: 30-level language (other than English) or 30-level Fine/Performing Art**
- \*An applicant is permitted to be deficient in two of these subject areas. If admitted, students must clear any deficiencies before entering the second year of study.*
- **Regular Admission – post-secondary (18 credit units of transferable post-secondary):**
    - 18 or more of transferable credit units from a recognized and/or accredited post-secondary institution.
    - Proficiency in English.
    - No high school prerequisites required.
  - **Special Mature Admission:**
    - Proof of age (21 or older).
    - A written submission demonstrating capacity to undertake university-level studies.
    - Transcripts of any secondary or post-secondary coursework.
    - Résumé.
    - Proficiency in English.

## Selection Criteria:

- Academic record
  - Average is calculated using or on five high school subjects or on 18 or more transferable credit units from a recognized and/or accredited post-secondary institution.
  - Transfer applicants to the ITEP program are not required to meet a transfer average.
  - Final admission decisions for the ITEP and SUNTEP programs are made by the program offices.

## Categories of Applicants:

### Regular Admission

Admission is based on successful completion of secondary level standing with a minimum overall average of 70% in the required subjects; or admission is based on the successful completion of at least 18 credit units of transferable university-level coursework from a recognized and/or accredited post-secondary institution, with an average of at least 60% (SUNTEP program only).

### Special (Mature) Admission

Special (Mature) Admission is available to applicants who do not qualify for Regular Admission. Applicants must be 21 years of age or older by the first day of classes, be entering their first-year of study, and have successfully completed less than 18 credit units of transferable university-level coursework. Applicants must submit a special admission package including proof of age, a written

request for Special (Mature) Admission that demonstrates reasonable probability of academic success and a summary of work and personal experience since leaving school. Academic transcripts must be submitted if any Grade 12 or post-secondary courses have been completed.





## Report from University Council

---

### FOR CONFIRMATION

**PRESENTED BY:** Kevin Flynn; Chair, Academic Programs Committee of Council

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** **Change to Admissions Qualifications - College of Medicine**

**DECISION REQUESTED:** *It is recommended*  
That Senate confirm the approval of changes to admission qualifications for students entering the College of Medicine in or after August 2018.

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

The *University of Saskatchewan Act* states that decisions regarding admission qualifications and enrolment quotas for university programs are to be approved by Council and confirmed by University Senate.

The College of Medicine has been investigating ways to help ensure access to the MD program for Saskatchewan residents from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Students who are unsuccessful in achieving a regular offered seat and who qualify through the answers provided on the Diversity and Social Accountability Admissions Program (DSAAP) questionnaire will be considered for a DSAAP seat. The DSAAP questionnaire asks for information on an applicant's family gross household income, as well the highest level of education achieved by the applicant's parents, whether the applicant was raised by a single parent or in a non-traditional household, and about the social background of the applicant's family, amongst other questions. The College of Medicine did significant research into the impact of socio-economic status on academic outcomes and sees the DSAAP as a mechanism for recognizing that impact on applicants.

There will be six seats offered through the initial implementation of this admissions program. These seats were created by reducing the number of out-of-province seats from ten to five and by adding one seat from the regular SK resident seats.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

The Faculty Council of the College of Medicine approved the Diversity and Social Accountability Admissions Program at its January 25, 2017 meeting. The Academic Programs Committee reviewed these proposed admissions changes at its February 8, 2017 meeting and was very supportive of this endeavour to make admission to the College of Medicine more accessible for students applying from lower-income families. University Council approved the changes at its March 23, 2017 meeting.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Diversity and Social Accountability Admissions Program for Saskatchewan Residents

**MOTION**

*That the College of Medicine implement a Diversity and Social Accountability Admissions Program for Saskatchewan Residents that has the operational parameters described below.*

A motion approving this new College of Medicine admissions program was passed at the Faculty Council of Medicine meeting held January 25, 2017.

The proposal for this new admissions program is now being submitted for consideration by University Council (through the Academic Programs Committee) and, if approved there, subsequently will be submitted to the University Senate for final approval.

Submitted on behalf of the College of Medicine,




---

Dr. Barry Ziola  
Director of Admissions  
2017.01.26

**Diversity and Social Accountability Admissions Program (DSAAP\*)  
for Saskatchewan (SK) Residents: Operational Parameters**

[1] The initial implementation of the DSAAP will involve 6 seats. These 6 seats will be for residents of Saskatchewan (SK) only, with the 6 seats created by reducing the number of out-of-province (OP) seats from 10 to 5 and adding 1 seat from the regular SK resident seats (which number  $\geq 80$  of the currently available 100 seats). Here it is important to note that this 50% reduction in the annual OP seat allotment still allows the College of Medicine to meet its diversity and cross-Canada student perspective requirements vis a vis accreditation. It should also be noted that for the last 11 in-coming classes, where the total seats available started at 60 per year and rose through 68, then 84, and to now 100 seats per year, the 10% of seats historically assigned to OP students have been completely filled only 3 times (58% of available seats were filled on average during the 11 years, with the fill % ranging from 10% to 100% in any given year).

[2] All SK residents will first be considered through the regular SK admission rank number (ARN) process (50% Multiple mini-interview or MMI + 30% university academic average or UAA + 20% Medical College Admissions Test or MCAT). If unsuccessful in achieving a regular offered seat, SK residents who qualify through the answers they provide to a DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire (see details below) will then be considered for a DSAAP seat.

[3] Applicants who self-declare as being of Aboriginal descent will continue to be first considered through the usual SK ARN process. If unsuccessful in achieving a regular offered seat, these applicants will then continue to be considered for admission through the Aboriginal Admissions Program (10 seats are available), but not through the DSAAP as well.

---

\* **Abbreviations used:** ARN, admission rank number  
DSAAP, Diversity and Social Accountability Admissions Program  
OP, out-of-province  
SK, Saskatchewan

[4] Once applications close October 1, all SK applicants, except for self-declared Aboriginals, will be sent a DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire (see below) containing two parts. The covering message with the questionnaire will be that it is voluntary for the individual to apply for consideration through the DSAAP – i.e., that **a response is not obligatory**. If the individual voluntarily participates, they then will be considered within the DSAAP framework for one of the 6 DSAAP seats.

[5] Part A of the DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire will have a single question dealing with average household gross income over the past 5 years (threshold of \$80,000<sup>†</sup>). *To be qualified, and thus considered for a DSAAP seat, a SK applicant **will first have to answer** that their 5-year average gross household income was below the threshold of \$80,000.*

[6] SK Applicants answering *yes* to the question in Part A then will go on in Part B to answer questions dealing with different aspects of social economic status (SES) pertinent to SK residents. For each Part B question answered *yes*, the applicant's ARN would be augmented by +0.1 when the applicant is considered for a DSAAP seat.

[7] Qualified DSAAP applicants will then be re-ranked by their modified ARNs and the top 6 would be offered one of the 6 DSAAP seats in the initial offering of seats done in mid May. Based on their modified ARNs, up to 6 next ranked DSAAP applicants would be the reserve or 'wait-list' DSAAP applicants.

[8] If one of the 6 top DSAAP applicants would have come up on the regular SK wait-list for an offer of a seat (i.e., achieve a seat through the usual SK admissions process), then that offer would go instead to the next ranked DSAAP applicant on the reserve DSAAP list.

[9] The 5 remaining OP seats will be split 3:2 for medicine training years 2-4 being in Saskatoon and Regina, respectively. The 6 DSAAP seats would be similarly split 4:2. Any applicant first offered a DSAAP seat who later is offered a seat off the regular SK wait-list will retain their initial medicine years 2-4 assigned learning site. An applicant offered a seat as described in [7] just above will have their learning site assigned as if they had come off the regular SK wait-list at the ARN of the initial DSAAP individual they are replacing.

[10] DSAAP applicants are required to provide appropriate tax assessment information for all household members (see below - **Part A** of the supplemental admissions questionnaire) and can be required to provide documentation to validate any of their answers to questions [2] through [10] in **Part B** of the DSAAP supplemental questionnaire.

[11] DSAAP applicants will be asked to provide the names and contact information for 2 References who can speak to the applicant's circumstances growing up. These references will be contacted by phone to answer a standard questionnaire constructed to solicit information independently speaking to an applicant's answers in Part A and/or Part B of the DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire. Arms-length individuals (i.e., non-household or related family members) are preferred as the references used. In the event two such references are not available, a letter can be provided explaining why this is so and why non-arms-length individual(s) should be used as a reference.

---

<sup>†</sup> Statistics Canada information for 2014 gives \$85,710 as the median Family Income in Saskatchewan. The *threshold* average family income of \$80,000 forming the basis of Part A of the DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire thus is appropriately just below the median income for Saskatchewan Families.

**Questions in the DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire** (Answers, and details and documentation provided in support of *yes* answers, will only be used for the DSAAP and will be handled by the confidentiality policies and procedures used for all other College of Medicine admissions information.)

**Part A**

**Question:** Is the average household gross income for your family over the past 5 years <\$80,000 per year? **If yes, proceed to the questions in Part B.** Also, you must submit copies of the annual tax assessments for individuals, including yourself, making up your household for each of the past 5 years. The annual tax assessments you submit in support of a *yes* answer here will also support your answers to Part B questions [1] and [2].

**Part B**

[1] Is the average household gross income for your family over the past 5 years <\$65,000 per year?

[2] Is the average household gross income for your family over the past 5 years <\$50,000 per year?

For questions 3 - 12, if you answer *yes* in any case, please provide details supporting your answer.

[3] Was high school graduation (or less) the highest education level achieved by each of your parents or guardians?

[4] Did your family ever receive social assistance in the pre-university years of your life?

[5] Over the past 10 years, did your parents' or guardians' jobs involve clerical, service, or unskilled labour?

[6] Were you raised by a teen parent, single parent, or family other than your biological parents for  $\geq 10$  of your pre-university years?

[7] Do you come from a family of 3 or more children?

[8] Were you ever in foster care?

[9] Are you a single parent taking care of one or more children?

[10] Were you or your immediate family admitted to Canada with refugee status?

[11] During your 4-year baccalaureate degree, were you registered for  $\geq 2$  years as having a disability? (The registration date of the disability and with which university is all that is needed for a *yes* answer: confirmation of registration is all that will be done - details of the registered disability are not required.)

[12] Did you complete all of your high school education in, and graduate from, a high school in a rural area? (A rural area is defined as an area with a population of  $\leq 4,000$  people as per the 2011 Saskatchewan Population census data.)

**NOTES**

(i) With only a *yes* answer to Part A, an individual would be eligible to be considered for a DSAAP seat, but with no upwards adjustment of their ARN. Each *yes* answer to Part B questions will give the DSAAP applicant a +0.1 adjustment in their ARN. Consequently, with 12 questions for Part B, the maximum ARN adjustment possible would be +1.2.

(ii) It is important to emphasize that this ARN adjustment is specific for the *relative* positioning of only those applicants who qualify to be considered for one of the 6 DSAAP seats (i.e., their answer to the **Part A question is yes**).

(iii) Individuals sent the DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire will be notified that it will be up to them to decide the answers, and how to document those answers, for each of the questions. In submitting details and documentation, individuals will be told that they can redact confidential identifiers (for example, social insurance numbers).

(iv) The Admissions Committee (or delegated sub-committee thereof) will review all materials provided (in a de-identified form) and decide if each *yes* answer in the DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire will be accepted. Included in the consideration of DSAAP applicants will be the feedback provided by the two references. Details will not be provided back to applicants. In parallel with other decisions made by the Admissions Committee, DSAAP applicants ultimately will be told only whether or not they have been successful in being awarded a seat through the DSAAP process.

### **Background for the DSAAP Proposal**<sup>‡</sup>

[A] Household income for medical student's parents or guardians is disproportionately high relative to the Canadian population at large. In Table 6 of the 2002 study by Dhall et al (1), 53.7% of Canadian medical students come from households whose gross income was reported as >\$80,000 per year. For Canadian households at large, the comparable percentage was 19.9%. These two values point to children born into higher income families being disproportionately represented in Canadian Medical Schools. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that 17.0% of Canadian medical students analyzed in this study came from households with incomes >\$150,000, while the number of Canadian households with this income level was only 2.7%. With regard to gaining entrance into a Canadian medical school, the impact ratios for an applicant coming from a household with incomes of >\$80,000 and >\$150,000 were found to be a staggering 2.7X and 6.3X, respectively. In Table 1 of the more recent study by Young et al (2), 38.7%, 12.1% and 6.8% of medical student at McGill University, McMaster University, U. of Ottawa and U. of Toronto came from households with incomes of \$100,000-249,999, \$250,000-499,999 and ≥ \$500,000, respectively. This newer data again points to individuals coming from high economic backgrounds being advantaged in their choice of medicine as a career.

(1) I.A. Dhall, J.C. Kwong, D.L. Steiner, R.E. Baddour, A.E. Waddell, I.L. Johnson, 2002. Characteristics of first-year students in Canadian medical schools. *Can. Med. Assoc. J.* 166:1029-1035.

(2) M.E. Young, S. Razack, M.D. Hanson, S. Slade, L. Varpio, K.L. Dore, D. McKnight, 2012. Calling for a broader conceptualization of diversity: surface and deep diversity in four Canadian medical schools. *Acad. Med.* 87:1501-1510.

[B] In parallel with the data in [A], similar findings have been published regarding the social economic status (SES) of medical students in American medical schools. For 1987 through 2005, 48-51% of first year medical students came from a household with income in the top 20%, while only 5-6% came from households with income in the bottom 20%.

(3) D. Grbic, D.J. Jones, S.T. Case, 2015. The role of socioeconomic status in medical school admissions: validation of a socioeconomic indicator for use in medical school admissions. *Acad. Med.* 90:953-960.

[C] As far as Canadian Medical Schools are concerned, to date, schools in the Western provinces have played a leading role in SES-related admissions processes. The U. of S. has had a long-standing

---

<sup>‡</sup> References or documentation numbered (1) through (10) are in order in the pdf provided along with this document.

Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission-approved Program for admission of self-declared Aboriginal applicants. The UBC has processes established for assisting self-declared Aboriginal students into medicine. The U. of C. initial thrust in this area is briefly described below in [E]. Lastly, the U. of M.'s first foray into adjusting admissions processes in relation to social issues was their introduction of a supplemental application (i.e., questionnaire) for *rurality*. The information provided by applicants is then scored and used to adjust composite application scores upwards so as to increase the probability of a *rural* applicant gaining admission.

(4) M. Raghavan, B.D. Martin, D. Roberts, F. Aoki, B.A. Mackalski, J.D. Sandham, 2011. Increasing the enrolment of rural applicants to the faculty of medicine and addressing diversity using a priority matrix approach to assign values to rural attributes. *Rural and Remote Health* 11: article 1646.

(5) Supplementary application for rural characteristics used by the Faculty of Medicine, U. of M. Version 2011-12 (1 page).

[D] The U. of M. Faculty of Medicine has recently extended their approach to increasing entrance of applicants with a rural background to enhancing the entrance probability of applicants with disadvantaged social determinants. Document [6] is the actual submission from the U. of M. Faculty of Medicine Admissions to the U. of M. Senate Committee on Admissions, which has approved the approach. It proposes using the same priority matrix approach (again based on a supplemental application/questionnaire) to enhance the probability of entrance for applicants coming from SES-disadvantaged backgrounds. Interestingly, to accommodate this proposal, the number of seats held for out of province applicants was concurrently reduced from 10% to 5% of the 110 seats available each year.

(6) B.D. Martin, Director of Admissions, College of Medicine, U. of Manitoba, March 13, 2015. A proposal to the Senate Committee on Admissions from the College of Medicine recommending revised admissions criteria for the undergraduate medical education program (17 pages).

[E] Lastly, the U. of C. Medical School has just added a "right-out-of-high-school" program called *Pathways to Medicine Scholarship*. This program is modeled on several such programs in the USA and elsewhere that focus on students right out of high school, and it targets populations under-represented in medicine (low SES, Aboriginal ancestry and/or growing up in a rural community). The U. of C. program has a high current cost of \$27,000 per student who successfully completes the requirements (4 year degree, all components of a medical school preparatory program). Accepted *Pathways* applicants who have the basic requirements met to make application are automatically offered a seat.

(7) <http://cumming.ucalgary.ca/pathways>

Question #7 on *number of children in the family* in Part B of the DSAAP supplemental admissions questionnaire is supported by the following two documents.

(8) This is 2011 Statistics Canada giving the number of children in different types of SK families. The average is essentially one, except for female or male single parents.

(9) This document gives calculation of the cost of raising a child (based on 2004 Manitoba data) to age 18, with the number being just over \$166,000. So, with three or more children, not many \$ are left to support extra-curricular activities, trips to Europe or elsewhere, or support a child going to university without their having to work.

Finally, the article provided as document (10) was very recently published in *University Affairs*. It speaks in a general and timely way to the DSAAP proposal.

## Report from University Council

---

### FOR CONFIRMATION

- PRESENTED BY:** Kevin Flynn; Chair, Academic Programs Committee of Council
- DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017
- SUBJECT:** **Direct-entry Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) program in Kinesiology with 85% Admissions Average**
- DECISION REQUESTED:** *It is recommended*  
That Senate confirm the approval of a direct-entry Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) program in Kinesiology with 85% admissions average

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

The *University of Saskatchewan Act* states that decisions regarding admissions qualifications and enrolment quotas for university programs are to be approved by Council and confirmed by University Senate.

The College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies has the ability to implement direct-entry Ph.D. programs within an approved template, as approved by University Council in December 2012 and confirmed by Senate in April 2013. The direct-entry Ph.D. in Kinesiology does not fit within the template because of the admissions average requirement of 85%, which exceeds the 80% requirement outlined in the template. This proposed change required Council approval, and now Senate confirmation.

The direct-entry Ph.D. program follows the same programmatic requirements as a combined Masters and Ph.D. program. This is consistent with other direct-entry Ph.D. programs. By requiring that students applying for direct entry to the Ph.D. in Kinesiology have a minimum admissions average of 85% (as opposed to the normal 80% admissions requirement for direct-entry Ph.D. programs), the college is expecting to identify and recruit exceptionally strong undergraduate students to the program and to be able to fund them at the Ph.D. level immediately. By offering a direct-entry Ph.D., the College of Kinesiology also intends to encourage students applying with a professional Master's degree or a non-thesis based Master's degree to apply directly to a Ph.D. program. With this new entry option the college is hoping to strengthen interest in undergraduate research and to attract students with a strong research background into the college.

Students who do not meet the 85% admission average can still apply to the Master's program in Kinesiology with the possibility of transferring into the PhD program after a year in that program.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

The proposal was discussed at the Academic Programs Committee on October 6, 2016, November 17, 2016, and March 1, 2017. At the last of these meetings the committee recommended that Council approve the direct-entry Ph.D. program in Kinesiology with an 85% admission average as a requirement for admission. University Council approved the changes at its March 23, 2017 meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Proposal for direct-entry admission for the Ph.D. in Kinesiology program



# Memorandum

**To:** Dr. Kevin Flynn, Chair, Academic Programs Committee of University Council

**CC:** Dr. Jon Farthing, Graduate Chair, College of Kinesiology

**From:** Office of the Associate Dean, College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (CGPS)

**Date:** February 22, 2017

**Re:** Implementing Direct-Entry PhD in Kinesiology

---

In April 2013, University Senate confirmed a new admission option for students to enter PhD programs without the completion of a master's degree. The new PhD program admission has been referred to as "direct-entry". Since the option has been available, the College of Kinesiology faculty have considered the option on several occasions, and they would now like to offer the admission category. While implementation of the direct-entry PhD admission option has been under the authority of the CGPS, the Kinesiology grad program would like to require an admission average of 85%, which is higher than the CGPS standard of 80%. Ultimately, faculty in Kinesiology want to ensure that students permitted admission under the direct-entry option are very strong academically. Currently, PhD admission in Kinesiology requires the completion of a thesis-based master's degree. By implementing the direct-entry option, the Kinesiology program faculty would consider PhD admission from exceptionally qualified students with bachelor's degrees and non-thesis master's degrees. Direct-entry PhD admission options allow academic units an advantage in recruitment. Options to enter a master's program and transfer to a PhD will continue to exist.

With the CGPS direct-entry PhD requirements, in addition to the increased admission average requirement, the programmatic requirements are also increased in comparison to regular PhD programming as students must complete the combined minimum credit unit requirements of both the master's and PhD programs. In Kinesiology, the master's program requires a minimum of 12 credit units of coursework while the PhD requires a minimum of 3 credit units of coursework. The direct-entry PhD program will require a minimum of 15 credit units of coursework. This is consistent with the existing programmatic requirements for students transferring from a master's degree to a PhD. Direct-entry PhD programs have their own listing in the university program catalogue, and they are set up with their own codes in the student information system to facilitate use of the degreeworks audit tool. While the degree awarded is Doctor of Philosophy, administratively a new program option is being requested.

Attached please find:

- A copy of the memo from the Executive Committee of CGSR recommending approval of the program
- A copy of the memo from the Graduate Programs Committee of CGSR recommending approval of the program
- The complete program proposal
- A complete catalogue entry

Please note that consultation with the Registrar was sought; however, the Consultation with the Registrar form was not completed as this would not result in any new system implications.

If you have any questions, please contact [Kelly.clement@usask.ca](mailto:Kelly.clement@usask.ca) (306-966-2229).

## Memorandum

**To:** Dr. Adam Baxter-Jones, Chair, Executive Committee of CGSR

**CC:** Dr. Jon Farthing, Graduate Chair, College of Kinesiology  
Dr. Trever Crowe, Associate Dean, College of Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR)

**From:** Dr. Dionne Pohler, Chair, Graduate Programs Committee, CGSR

**Date:** June 13, 2016

**Re:** Implement Direct-Entry PhD program in Kinesiology

---

The Graduate Programs Committee met on June 9, 2016, and reviewed the proposal noted above.

It was noted that the CGSR had the authority to implement direct-entry PhD programs under an approved template. The College of Kinesiology was wishing to pursue implementation with a minimum admission average of 85%, which was beyond the 80% average indicated on the approved template.

Members noted that the College of Kinesiology had identified some specific professional backgrounds in the proposal, such as Master of Public Health or Master of Physical Therapy. Members suggested that clinical professional programs often do not result in high academic averages.

Ultimately, the Graduate Programs Committee agreed that the College of Kinesiology had provided sufficient rationale to introduce the Direct-Entry PhD program with an 85% admission average, and the following motion was passed:

**Motion: *To approve the direct-entry PhD program in Kinesiology with an 85% admission average required.***

**Whiting/Desjardins CARRIED**

If you have any questions, please contact Kelly Clement at [Kelly.clement@usask.ca](mailto:Kelly.clement@usask.ca) or 306-966-2229.

:kc



UNIVERSITY OF  
SASKATCHEWAN

## Proposal for Academic or Curricular Change

### PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION

**Title of proposal:** **Ph.D. Direct Entry option for College of Kinesiology**

\*Note that the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies has authority to implement the direct-entry PhD program; however, the full proposal is begin presented as the proposal contains a request for a higher admission average for the direct-entry PhD program (85% rather than 80%).

The option to transfer from M.Sc. to Ph.D. will continue to exist. Traditional Ph.D. admission will continue for students with an earned thesis-based Master's degree.

Degree(s): **Ph.D.**

Field(s) of Specialization: **Kinesiology**

Level(s) of Concentration:

Option(s):

Degree College: **Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

Contact person(s) (name, telephone, fax, e-mail): **Dr. Jon Farthing at: [jon.farthing@usask.ca](mailto:jon.farthing@usask.ca)  
Tel: (306) 966-1068**

Proposed date of implementation: **May 2018**

### Proposal Document

Please provide information which covers the following sub topics. The length and detail should reflect the scale or importance of the program or revision. Documents prepared for your college may be used. Please expand this document as needed to embrace all your information.

## 1. Academic justification:

- a. Describe why the program would be a useful addition to the university, from an academic programming perspective.

The University of Saskatchewan already offers Ph.D. Direct Entry through CGPS. Individual units are permitted to offer the program at their prerogative according to the admission and degree requirements outlined by CGPS <http://www.usask.ca/CGPS/policy-and-procedure/minimum-entrance-requirements.php#5>. The goals and objectives of Ph.D. direct entry programs are described by CGPS. The College of Kinesiology discussed the Ph.D. direct entry option at graduate programs committee and faculty council. Faculty noted that the Ph.D. Direct Entry option is intended for EXCEPTIONALLY strong undergraduate students with demonstrated research experience. Kinesiology faculty recognized that CGPS's minimum entrance average does not qualify as exceptional. The College of Kinesiology has proposed "A cumulative weighted average of at least 85% in the last two years of undergraduate study", rather than the minimum CGPS admission requirement of 80% for Direct-Entry Ph.D. program options. According to the current U of S "Grading System", students with 80-90% average only show as "Excellent" performance, and "Exceptional" is considered in 90-100% average. The College of Kinesiology has also noted that potential graduate students with clinical backgrounds, such as medical doctors, physical therapists, occupational therapists, Masters of Public Health, and chiropractors are interested in pursuing a Ph.D. in the program but are dissuaded by the requirement to enter as a Master's student. With the traditional Ph.D. program, students are required to have a thesis-based master's degree. The direct entry option has the potential to enhance recruitment and retention of Ph.D. graduate students in Kinesiology.

- b. Giving consideration to strategic objectives, specify how the new program fits the university signature areas and/or integrated plan areas, and/or the college/school, and/or department plans.

The University of Saskatchewan has strategic goals to enhance- the recruitment and retention of high quality graduate students and to continue to improve our national reputation as leaders in discovery and innovation. Central to this reputation of innovation is research and graduate student training, particularly at the Ph.D. level. The proposed Ph.D. direct entry program will enhance our ability to recruit the highest achieving undergraduate students with research potential.

The College of Kinesiology's Third Integrated Plan outlined efforts to enhance graduate recruitment and provide opportunities that will set us apart from our competitors. The Ph.D. Direct Entry option will enable us to recruit the highest-level undergraduate students with demonstrated research experience to enrol in a Ph.D. program immediately after graduating from the undergraduate program. Fittingly, the college also highlighted goals to enhance the undergraduate research curriculum. As described in 1.d. below, we will become just the third

*Kinesiology program within the prairie provinces to offer this program (along with UofM and UofC). By enhancing graduate student recruitment potential, particularly those with health professional backgrounds, this program would help the college achieve its IP3 goal of maintaining at least 25 of 45 graduate students at the Ph.D. level (currently we have 19 Ph.D. students with at least 5 near completion in 2016).*

- c. *Is there a particular student demographic this program is targeted towards and, if so, what is that target? (e.g., Aboriginal, mature, international, returning).*

*College of Kinesiology intends to recruit exceptional honours undergraduate students, and clinical health professionals without a thesis-based Master's degree such as those with Master of Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Medical Doctor, Doctor of Chiropractor, or Master of Public Health designations.*

- d. *What are the most similar competing programs in Saskatchewan, and in Canada? How is this program different?*

*Information on the most competitive programs in province and Canada are listed as follows.*

| <b>Name of universities</b>    | <b>Ph.D. Direct Entry option</b> | <b>Minimum admission requirement</b>                         | <b>Convert to U of S standards</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| University of Regina           | N/A                              | Only have PhDs, but no direct entry                          | N/A                                |
| University of Calgary          | Yes                              | B+   | 78%                                |
| University of Alberta          | N/A                              | Only have PhDs, but no direct entry                          | N/A                                |
| University of British Columbia | Yes                              | A  | 85-89%                             |
| Simon Fraser University        | Yes                              | A- (3.67/4.33 scale)   | 86%                                |
| University of Victoria         | Yes                              | Over 7.0 on the U of Victoria 9.0 scale                      | 86%                                |
| University of Manitoba         | Yes                              | "An outstanding academic background", but no detail provided | N/A                                |
| McGill University              | Yes                              | CGPA of 3.7 out of 4.0 scale                                 | 86%                                |
| University of Toronto          | Yes                              | A-   | 80-84%                             |

*Although our proposed Ph.D. direct entry option will not be overly different from competing programs across Canada, it will allow us to stay competitive on the national stage. Note that the majority of competing programs require an average in the mid-eighties.*

## 2. Admissions

- a. *What are the admissions requirements of this program?*
  - *A four-year honours bachelor's degree, or equivalent, in an academic discipline relevant to the proposed field of study.*
  - *A cumulative weighted average of at least 85% (U of S grade system equivalent) in the last two years of undergraduate study (that is, at least 60 credit units of course work).*
  - *Demonstrated ability for independent thought, advanced study, and independent research.*
  - *Evidence of research contributions (e.g. normally as published articles, abstracts conference proceedings).*
  - *Language Proficiency Requirements: Proof of English proficiency may be required for international applicants and for applicants whose first language is not English. See the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Academic Information and Policies in this Catalogue for more information.*

## 3. Description of the program

- a. *What are the curricular objectives, and how are these accomplished?*

*Program objectives are achieved through accessibility to experiences that facilitate academic achievement within program coursework, design and execute research projects, gain teaching experience, connect with community and gain practical skills through their research. The curricular objectives are consistent with CGPS objectives for Ph.D. direct entry programs.*
- b. *Describe the modes of delivery, experiential learning opportunities, and general teaching philosophy relevant to the programming. Where appropriate, include information about whether this program is being delivered in a distributed format.*

*Consistent with the existing MSc transfer to PhD program option*
- c. *Provide an overview of the curriculum mapping.*

*Consistent with the existing MSc transfer to PhD program option*
- d. *Identify where the opportunities for synthesis, analysis, application, critical thinking, problem solving are, and other relevant identifiers.*

*Consistent with the existing MSc transfer to PhD program option*
- e. *Explain the comprehensive breadth of the program.*

*Consistent with the existing MSc transfer to PhD program option*
- f. *Referring to the university "Learning Charter", explain how the 5 learning goals are addressed, and what degree attributes and skills will be acquired by graduates of the program.*

*Consistent with the existing MSc transfer to PhD program option*
- g. *Describe how students can enter this program from other programs (program transferability).*

*Not applicable*

h. Specify the criteria that will be used to evaluate whether the program is a success within a timeframe clearly specified by the proponents in the proposal.

*Not applicable*

i. If applicable, is accreditation or certification available, and if so how will the program meet professional standard criteria. Specify in the budget below any costs that may be associated.

*Not applicable*

#### **4. Consultation – Not applicable**

a. Describe how the program relates to existing programs in the department, in the college or school, and with other colleges. Establish where students from other programs may benefit from courses in this program. Does the proposed program lead into other programs offered at the university or elsewhere?

b. List units that were consulted formally, and provide a summary of how consultation was conducted and how concerns that were raised in consultations have been addressed. Attach the relevant communication in an appendix.

c. Provide evidence of consultation with the University Library to ensure that appropriate library resources are available.

d. List other pertinent consultations and evidence of support, if applicable (e.g., professional associations, accreditation bodies, potential employers, etc.)

*The majority of the above is not applicable for this proposed change because there is an existing Ph.D. program in Kinesiology. The proposed direct-entry Ph.D. program would provide an additional admission option. A table is provided in response to 1.d. above which outlines the competing programs that were surveyed in the process.*

#### **5. Budget**

a. How many instructors will participate in teaching, advising and other activities related to core program delivery (not including distribution/ breadth requirements or electives)? (estimate the percentage time for each person).

*No anticipated change from existing graduate programming as potential increases in total enrolment are not expected to be significant. Rather we are hoping for a higher percentage of PhD students within our total graduate student complement. Our current max capacity is 50 graduate students of which we hope to maintain 50% or more at the PhD level.*

b. What courses or programs are being eliminated in order to provide time to teach the additional courses?

*none*

c. How are the teaching assignments of each unit and instructor affected by this proposal?

*None anticipated*

d. Describe budget allocations and how the unit resources are reallocated to accommodate this proposal. (Unit administrative support, space issues, class room availability, studio/practice rooms laboratory/clinical or other instructional space requirements).



*No anticipated change from existing graduate programming as potential increases in total enrolment are not expected to be significant. Rather we are hoping for a higher percentage of PhD students within our total graduate student complement.*

- e. *If this program is to be offered in a distributed context, please describe the costs associated with this approach of delivery and how these costs will be covered. N/A.*
- f. *If this is an interdisciplinary program, please indicate whether there is a pool of resources available from other colleges involved in the program. N/A.*
- g. *What scholarships will students be able to apply for, and how many? What other provisions are being provided for student financial aid and to promote accessibility of the program?  
Student funding opportunities will be consistent with the existing PhD program. Kinesiology faculty approved a motion to fund direct-entry students with the same priorities for all PhD students in the program.*
- h. *What is the program tuition? Will the program utilize a special tuition model or standard tuition categories? (The approval authority for tuition is the Board of Governors).  
Standard graduate term-based tuition.*
- i. *What are the estimated costs of program delivery, based on the total time commitment estimates provided? (Use TABBS information, as provided by the College/School financial officer)  
No anticipated change from existing graduate programming as potential increases in total enrolment are not expected to be significant. Rather we are hoping for a higher percentage of PhD students within our total graduate student complement. Our current max capacity is 50 graduate students of which we hope to maintain 50% or more at the PhD level.*
- j. *What is the enrolment target for the program? How many years to reach this target? What is the minimum enrolment, below which the program ceases to be feasible? What is the maximum enrolment, given the limitations of the resources allocated to the program?  
At this time we hope to increase the ratio of PhD students in our graduate program rather than increase the total student numbers.*
- k. *What are the total expected revenues at the target enrolment level, separated into core program delivery and distribution/breadth requirements or electives? What portion of this expected revenue can be thought of as incremental (or new) revenue?  
N/A*
- l. *At what enrolment number will this program be independently sustainable? If this enrolment number is higher than the enrolment target, where will the resources come from to sustain the program, and what commitments define the supply of those resources?  
N/A*
- m. *Proponents are required to clearly explain the total incremental costs of the program. This is to be expressed as: (i) total cost of resources needed to deliver the program: (ii) existing resources (including in-kind and tagged as such)*



*applied against the total cost: and (iii) a listing of those resource costs that will require additional funding (including new in-kind support).*

*No anticipated change from existing graduate programming as potential increases in total enrolment are not expected to be significant. Rather we are hoping for a higher percentage of PhD students within our total graduate student complement.*

- n. List all new funding sources and amounts (including in-kind) and the anticipated contribution of each to offsetting increment program costs. Please identify if any indicated funding is contingent on subsequent approval by a funding authority and/or future conditions. Also indicate under what conditions the program is expected to be cost neutral. The proponents should also indicated any anticipated surpluses/deficits associated with the new program*

*N/A*

## **College Statement**

Please provide here or attach to the online portal, a statement from the College which contains the following:

- Recommendation from the College regarding the program
- Description of the College process used to arrive at that recommendation
- Summary of issues that the College discussed and how they were resolved

## **Related Documentation**

At the online portal, attach any related documentation which is relevant to this proposal to the online portal, such as:

- Excerpts from the College Plan and Planning Parameters
- SPR recommendations
- Relevant sections of the College plan
- Accreditation review recommendations
- Letters of support
- Memos of consultation

It is particularly important for Council committees to know if a curriculum changes are being made in response to College Plans and Planning Parameters, review recommendations or accreditation recommendations.

**Consultation Forms** At the online portal, attach the following forms, as required

Required for all submissions:

- Consultation with the Registrar form
- Complete Catalogue entry, if proposing a new program, or excerpt of existing of existing program with proposed changes marked in red

## KIN Direct-Entry PhD

### Admission Requirements

*With the recommendation of the unit, direct entry Ph.D. admission is available to exceptionally strong students, who show great promise in terms of academic accomplishments and potential for research.*

- *A four-year honours bachelor's degree, or equivalent, in an academic discipline relevant to the proposed field of study.*
- *A cumulative weighted average of at least 85% (U of S grade system equivalent) in the last two years of undergraduate study (that is, at least 60 credit units of course work).*
- *Demonstrated ability for independent thought, advanced study, and independent research.*
- *Evidence of research contributions (e.g. normally as published articles, abstracts, conference proceedings).*
- *Language Proficiency Requirements: Proof of English proficiency may be required for international applicants and for applicants whose first language is not English. See the College of Graduate Studies and Research Academic Information and Policies in this Catalogue for more information.*

### Degree Requirements

Students must maintain continuous registration in the KIN 996 course.

- At least 9 credit units of course work at the graduate level must be successfully completed in the first year of the program.
- Within the first year of program, successfully complete a Ph.D. Qualifying examination that is at least as rigorous as the defence for a Master's thesis in the program area.
- GSR 960.0
- GSR 961.0 if research involves human subjects
- GSR 962.0 if research involves animal subjects
- A minimum of 15 credit units, including:
  - KIN 807.3
  - KIN 808.3 Note: it is permissible, with the supervisor's and advisory committee's permission, to substitute another course in data analysis for KIN 808.3
  - Students must select, either from the College of Kinesiology or another College, an additional 9 credit units of courses related to area of study. These 9 credit units of course work must be approved by both the supervisor and advisory committee.
  - KIN 990.0
  - KIN 996.0
- Write a research grant; and have exposure to teaching during their time of residence in the program.
- Pass a comprehensive examination, after completing the required course work, and prior to focusing on their research and doctoral thesis.
- Write and successfully defend a thesis based on original investigation.
- Student must enroll in KIN 990.0 until the research proposal is presented.

Kinesiology graduate program admission and degree requirements

| Direct-Entry PhD   | Traditional PhD   |
|--|---|
| <b>Admission Requirements</b>  |   |
| <i>A four-year honours bachelor's degree, or equivalent, in an academic discipline relevant to the proposed field of study</i>   | <i>Master's degree, or equivalent, from a recognized university in a relevant academic discipline</i>   |
| <i>A cumulative weighted average of at least <b>85%</b> (U of S grade system equivalent) in the last two years of <b>undergraduate</b> study (that is, at least 60 credit units of course work).</i>   | <i>a cumulative weighted average of at least a 70% (U of S grade system equivalent) in the last two years of study (i.e. coursework required in Master's program)</i>   |
| <i>Demonstrated ability for independent thought, advanced study, and independent research.</i>   |   |
| <i>Evidence of research contributions (e.g. normally as published articles, abstracts, conference proceedings).</i>  |   |
| <i>Language Proficiency Requirements: Proof of English proficiency may be required for international applicants and for applicants whose first language is not English. See the College of Graduate Studies and Research Academic Information and Policies in this Catalogue for more information.</i>                         |   |
| <b>Degree Requirements</b>   |   |
| Students must maintain continuous registration in the KIN 996 course.  |   |
| GSR 960.0<br>GSR 961.0 if research involves human subjects<br>GSR 962.0 if research involves animal subjects   |   |
| <b>At least 9 credit units of course work at the graduate level must be successfully completed in the first year of the program</b>  |   |
| <i>Within the first year of program, successfully complete a Ph.D. Qualifying examination that is at least as rigorous as the defence for a Master's thesis in the program area.</i>   | <i>Within the first year of program, successfully complete a Ph.D. Qualifying examination that is at least as rigorous as the defence for a Master's thesis in the program area.<br/><b>Requirement may be waived for students having successfully defended a master's thesis in the research area.</b></i> |
| <b>A minimum of 15 credit units</b>  | <b>a minimum 3 credit units</b>   |
| <b>KIN 807.3<br/>KIN 808.3 <u>Note:</u> it is permissible, with the supervisor's and advisory committee's permission, to substitute another course in data analysis for KIN 808.3<br/>Students must select, either from the College of Kinesiology or another College, and additional 9 credit units of courses related to</b> |   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>area of study. These 9 credit units of course work must be approved by both the supervisor and advisory committee.</p>  |  |
| <p style="text-align: center;">KIN 990.0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">KIN 996.0</p>  |  |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Pass a comprehensive examination, after completing the required course work, and prior to focusing on their research and doctoral thesis.</p> |  |

Please note that consultation with the Registrar was sought; however, the Consultation with the Registrar form was not completed as this would not result in any new system implications.

## Report of the Senate Executive Committee

---

### FOR INFORMATION

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>PRESENTED BY:</b>    | Peter Stoicheff<br>Vice-chair, Senate executive committee |
| <b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> | April 22, 2017  |
| <b>SUBJECT:</b>         | <b>Report of the Senate executive committee</b>           |
| <b>SENATE ACTION:</b>   | For information only                                      |

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The Senate executive committee met on December 19, 2016, February 9, 2017 and March 16, 2017. The following information is a report on the work of the Senate Executive Committee.

#### **DISCUSSION SUMMARY:**

##### **Proposed Discussion Items from Senate Education**

The Senate education committee proposed that the topic 'Technology in teaching and research' be added to the Senate agenda. The Senate Executive committee agreed that this topic be discussed at the April Senate meeting.

##### **Requests Received by Senate Executive**

- 1) The executive committee received and considered a request made by Senate member Rae Mitten to learn more about the "Galleries Reimagined" project and approved the addition of this request to the April Senate agenda.
- 2) The executive committee received and considered a request from Greg Fowler, vice-president of finance and resources, to present an update on the Athletics and Recreation Facilities Master Plan and approved the addition of this request to the April Senate agenda.

##### **Continued committee work: Purpose of Senate**

The executive committee met on December 19, 2016 and February 9, 2017 to work toward a definition of the purpose of Senate. The committee reviewed documents on the history of the Senate and comparisons with other non-academic Senates, and have discussed possible tactics to better utilize the commitment and capabilities of Senators. The executive committee will continue this work over the coming months and will report to Senate at the October meeting.



## Report of the Senate Executive Committee

---

### FOR APPROVAL

- PRESENTED BY:** Peter Stoicheff  
Vice-chair, Senate executive committee
- DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017
- SUBJECT:** Nominations to the Senate nominations committee
- DECISION REQUESTED:** *That Senate approve the following Senate members to the Senate nominations committee for one-year terms beginning July 1, 2017 and ending June 30, 2018: Stuart Garven, Carrie Stavness, Rod Wiens and Christine Wesolowski.*

#### BACKGROUND:

The Senate executive committee met on March 16, 2017. The Senate executive committee is responsible for the nomination of members to the Senate nominations committee. The nominations committee is comprised by the chair of the executive committee (Chancellor) or a designate from the executive committee, four members of Senate, and the university secretary as a non-voting member. The term of a Senate member on the committee is one year, renewable annually for up to two additional years, for a maximum of three years.

#### SUMMARY:

The committee nominated Christine Wesolowski, existing member, and nominated Stuart Garven, Carrie Stavness, Rod Wiens to replace Lori Isinger, Vera Pezer and Colleen Toye as they have served the allowable three years on the nominations committee.

#### PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP FOR 2017/18:

Chancellor as chair of the executive committee (or designate from the executive committee)

Four members of Senate:

Stuart Garven

Carrie Stavness

Rod Wiens

Christine Wesolowski

University Secretary (non-voting member)





## Report of the Senate Nominations Committee

---

### FOR APPROVAL

**PRESENTED BY:** Lori Isinger, Chair, Nominations Committee

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** **Appointments to Senate committees for 2017/18**

**DECISION REQUESTED:** *That Senate approve the appointments to Senate committees and positions as indicated in the attached schedule for 2017/18, effective July 1, 2017.*

#### BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Pursuant to Senate Bylaws, the Senate nominations committee is mandated to recommend annually at the spring meeting of Senate individuals for membership on standing committees and to make appointments to standing committees of Senate and for Senate representation on other committees when vacancies arise between meetings of the Senate, and to report these to Senate at its next meeting.

The Senate nominations committee met on October 31, 2016, and appointed Victoria Neufeldt to the Senate ad hoc bylaws review committee as there was an outstanding appointment. The committee also appointed Roy Romanow to the Provost Search committee as Blaine Favel had resigned.

The committee met again on November 30, 2016, and appointed Carrie Stavness to the Executive Director, School of Public Health search committee and appointed the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association to represent Senate on the Dean, College of Nursing search committee.

At the February meeting the nominations committee appointed Adelle Kopp-Mckay to the Senate honorary degrees committee due to the resignation of Gary Gullickson.

The committee met on March 8, 2017, to recommend individuals for membership on all standing committees of Senate and these recommendations are attached.

#### ATTACHMENT:

1. Proposed Senate Committee Membership List 2017/18

## PROPOSED SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2017/18

**New members are indicated in bold type.**

*Re-appointed members are in italic type.*

\* Pending reappointment or re-election

### **Executive Committee**

Chancellor (Chair): Roy Romanow

President or designate: Peter Stoicheff

Two ex officio members: *Kishor Wasan, Mary Buhr*

Three appointed members: **Marcel de la Gorgendiere, Monica Kreuger, TBD**

Three elected members: *Allan Adam, Jim Pulfer, Corinna Stevenson*

One student member: TBA

Secretary (non-voting): Beth Bilson

### **Honorary Degrees Committee**

President (Chair): Peter Stoicheff

Chancellor (Vice Chair): Roy Romanow

Provost and Vice President (Academic): Michael Atkinson

Two ex officio members: **Chad London, Keith Willoughby**

Two appointed members: *Nadia Prokopchuk, Sandra MacArthur*

Two elected members: **Susanne Berg, Adelle Kopp-McKay**

One student member: TBA

Secretary (non-voting): Beth Bilson

### **Membership Committee**

Chair of committee: Davida Bentham\*

Chair of executive committee or designate: Roy Romanow

Four elected members of Senate: *Davida Bentham\**, **Leah Howie**, *Rae Mitten, Michelle Thompson\**

Secretary (non-voting): Beth Bilson

### **Education Committee**

Chair of committee: TBD

Two ex-officio members: *Terrence Downey, Michelle Prytula*

Two appointed members: *Nadia Prokopchuk, Pamela Acton*

Two elected members: **Evan Cole, Bud Sambasivam**

One student elected by student members of Senate: TBA

Secretary (non-voting): Beth Bilson

### **Round Table on Outreach and Engagement**

Four district Senators: *Corinna Stevenson, Adelle Kopp-McKay, Russ McPherson, Allan Adam*

### **University Council**

*Gary Gullickson* and **Rhonda Gough**

### **Senate Hearing Board for Non-academic Student Discipline and Appeals (3-year terms)**

Six members of Senate: *Dennis Lanigan (2019)*, **Christine Wesolowski (2020)**, **Rylund Hunter (2020)**, **Christine Hrudka (2020)**, TBD (2020), TBD (2020)

## Report of the Senate Membership Committee

---

### FOR INFORMATION

**PRESENTED BY:** Davida Bentham  
Chair, Membership Committee

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** **Update on Senate Election Engagement and Concerns**

#### BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

At the April 2016 Senate meeting the following motion was carried: "That issues regarding the engagement of the Senate electorate be brought to the membership committee to recommend some solutions and report back at the next Senate meeting so the body as a whole can address these issues". As the Senate membership committee is mandated by the Senate Bylaws "to hear appeals and complaints respecting the election of members of Senate..." the committee met on August 16, 2016, to discuss these concerns.

At the October 2016 Senate meeting, a number of suggestions were brought forward to Senators asking for comments or additional ideas and none were received at that time.

The Senate membership committee met on January 25, 2017 to discuss follow-up on these suggestions. Details were sought for each of the suggestions by the Office of the University Secretary in consultation with Alumni Relations, Marketing and Communications, Information and Communications Technology and the Registrar's Office and have the following items to report:

- Improvements to the Secretariat/Senate website  
*The university secretary in consultation with her staff feel the Senate website to be clear and useful. Senate elections are run using in-house systems in coordination with other departments and these are used at no cost.*
- 200-300 word limits on bios to allow for faster reading  
*A 200 word limit has been requested on the Senate Nomination form for 2017.*
- Continue to advertise in Sask weekly newspapers as was first used for the 2016 election  
*A story will be published in 39 newspapers by the Saskatchewan Weekly Newspaper Association's post-secondary supplement the week of January 23<sup>rd</sup>. Will cost approximately \$8,000.*
- Continued use of email, social media, Green and White advertising  
*The elections ads in the Green and White, social media featuring links to the election website, and emails to alumni will continue.*
- Send targeted emails to alumni in districts informing them of their district candidates  
*This can be done by providing content to the Alumni team. They suggested that best practice would be to send an email indicating information is available online, and direct interested*

alumni to visit the website. This would also help measure readership and interest (website hits, feedback received, etc).

- More public interest stories focusing on the purpose of Senate to generate interest in elections and Senate  
*The story that will run in the Sask Weekly papers has had content added to reflect this suggestion.*
- Connect with the president's tours and include Senators for those events to increase role of Senators and their visibility in their districts  
*The university secretary has spoken with the Vice-president University Relations and she is looking into this.*
- Have Senators present scholarships to high school graduates in their districts  
*The Associate Registrar advised that Senators are already invited by her department to present scholarships at award ceremonies in rural schools and that a member of her office will often present in Saskatoon. She advised that she will change the process to default to Senators when asking for presenters.*
- Add Senate election information to the Alumni website  
*Alumni Relations reported that they can accommodate this and would require the Office of the University Secretary to provide the text and preferred a link to current information rather than duplicating the information.*
- Add Senate information to alumni packages handed out at Convocation to increase visibility and knowledge of Senate  
*Alumni Relations advises against this. Ongoing surveys and feedback received have shown many do not pay close attention to the packages. They are currently collecting information to understand what would (if anything) be appropriate, however communications 5-6 months post convocation have had strong success to date.*
- Speak to PAWS programmers to see if there's anything that can be done with the PAWS site timing out for slower internet connections  
*Programmers at PAWS have been contacted and advise that the timeout for PAWS is 90 minutes while election timeout is 60 minutes. They felt that even with a slow dial up connection this should be adequate time to complete voting. This information will be added to the election voting information communications.*
- Encourage and support Alumni Relations in increasing number of alumni for which they have correct contact information  
*Alumni Relations had undertaken a marketing campaign in summer 2016 encouraging alumni to share their contact information. Response was quite positive with over 8,300 providing updated information. They will be running this campaign again in 2017.*
- Ask appointed association members of Senate to communicate and advocate for Senate elections within their organizations  
*An email was sent to appointed association members.*
- Look into a way for district nominees to communicate with members of their district  
*The most convenient method would be email and Alumni Relations can facilitate by targeting alumni within each district. However content would need to be reviewed by the university secretary keeping in mind each time alumni is contacted there is a significant unsubscribe rate.*
- Advertise that Senate meetings are open to the public  
*The marketing and communications team will add this to the election communications.*
- Ensure scrutineers are available to open paper ballots  
*Senate staff will ensure this is arranged.*
- Ensure election process is being followed administratively to comply with legal requirements and maintain trust in the election process  
*Senate staff will ensure processes are followed.*

In addition to the ideas outlined above, the membership committee asked that the Office of the University Secretary send an email to Senate association representatives to encourage their associations to vote in the Senate elections and to also seek permission from district and elected Senators to post their email addresses on the website to allow their constituents to contact them.



## Report of the Senate Membership Committee

---

### FOR APPROVAL

- PRESENTED BY:** Davida Bentham  
Chair, Membership Committee
- DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017
- SUBJECT:** Removal of the CCPA-SK as a member of Senate
- DECISION REQUESTED:** **The Senate membership committee recommends to Senate the removal of Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives – Saskatchewan (CCPA-SK), effective immediately.**

#### BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

At the January 25, 2017 meeting, the membership committee reviewed a request received from the CCPA-SK to withdraw its membership from the University of Saskatchewan Senate as there is only one member remaining on the association. One of the roles of the Senate membership committee is to monitor Senate membership and as such is forwarding the recommendation to remove the CCPA-SK from the membership of Senate.





## Report of the ad hoc Senate Bylaws Review Committee

---

### FOR APPROVAL

**PRESENTED BY:** Victoria Neufeldt, Chair  
Ad hoc Senate Bylaws Review Committee

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Senate Bylaw Amendments

**DECISION REQUESTED:**

*It is recommended: That Senate approve the amendments to Senate's bylaws regarding the appointment/re-appointment of the Chancellor as recommended by the ad hoc senate Bylaws Review Committee and set out in the attached bylaws.*

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

At the April 23, 2016 Senate meeting the following motion was carried:

KRISMER/MCPHERSON: That on the recommendation of the Joint Nomination Committee for the Chancellor, an ad hoc Senate Bylaws Review Committee be formed to bring forward the following amendments to the Senate Bylaws:

- a) a reappointment process for the chancellor that is more carefully thought out and articulated in the Bylaws, and
- b) to consider whether Section V.7(b) should be amended to indicate the Joint Nominations Committee for Chancellor be formed in the spring of the second year of the chancellor's first term.

Members of the ad hoc bylaws review committee (Lorne Calvert, Gary Gullickson, Crandall Hrynkiw, Russ McPherson, and Victoria Neufeldt as chair) met on November 15, 2016 and December 6, 2016 to review the Chancellor's position profile, Senate bylaw excerpts III.2. V.7 and Section 17 of the *University of Saskatchewan Act*.

The committee proposed changes to the Senate Bylaws as attached.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Proposed amendments to the Senate Bylaws, Section III. 2 and V.7.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BYLAWS SECTION III - with mark-up

2. Appointment or reappointment of Chancellor

Eligibility

- (a) Members of Senate are eligible to vote to appoint or reappoint the Chancellor.

Submission of Candidates for Nominations

- (a) The names of candidates for nomination to the position of Chancellor must be proposed in writing, endorsed by 7 members of Convocation, and submitted to the Secretary. The submission must include the written consent of the person being proposed.
- (b) Only persons who have been members of the Convocation for at least 10 years prior to the date for filing submissions are eligible to be appointed ~~or reappointed~~ as Chancellor.

Appointment or reappointment

- (a) ~~The Chancellor is required to advise if he or she is willing to serve a second term by June 30 in the second year of his or her first term.~~

- ~~(b) is for a second term the Chancellor~~ ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ ~~[Alternate wording for (b): If the current Chancellor is willing to be reappointed for a second term, the Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor will consider whether or not he or she should be recommended for reappointment. If the recommendation is for reappointment, the committee will recommend to Senate that the Chancellor be reappointed for a second term with no other nominations taken.]~~

- ~~(c) A call for nominations for Chancellor will be sent to Convocation on or before November 30 in the event:~~

- ~~i) the Chancellor is not willing to serve a second term;~~  
~~ii) the Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor does not recommend reappointment; or~~  
~~iii) it is the final year of the Chancellor's second term.~~

~~A call for nominations for Chancellor will be sent to Convocation on or before November 30 in the Chancellor's last year of service [possible additional wording: of his or her first and second terms]. In the event of a vacancy in the office of Chancellor, or if it is known there will be a vacancy in the academic year, a call for nominations for Chancellor will be sent to Convocation as soon as is reasonable.~~

- ~~(d) The Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor will recommend one person to the Senate for appointment as Chancellor.~~

- ~~(aed) The Chancellor nominee shall be appointed or reappointed by a majority vote at a duly constituted meeting of the Senate, on the recommendation of the Joint Nominations Committee for Chancellor, in accordance with Section 17 of the Act.~~

- ~~(bfe) If the nomination is not approved by a majority of those voting, then the Joint Nominations Committee for Chancellor will be asked to put forward an alternative nomination at the next meeting of the Senate.~~

7. Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor

(a) Membership

In accordance with Section 17 of the *University of Saskatchewan Act 1995*, the committee shall be composed of three members of the Senate and two members of the Board. The Board shall be invited to nominate two persons. The members of the Senate shall be nominated by the Nominations Committee as follows:

- (i) The President, in his/her capacity as vice-chancellor and vice-chair of the Senate.
- (ii) Two members of the Senate who have been elected under Section 24(1)(b) or 24(1)(c) of the *Act*. (i.e. elected Senators) nominated by the Nominations Committee and elected annually by Senate.

(b) Term

The Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor will be struck in the ~~third~~ fall ~~second~~ spring year of the Chancellor's term, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Chancellor, or if it is known there will be a vacancy in the academic year. Members' terms will coincide with the selection process for the Chancellor.

(c) Chair

The ~~J~~oint ~~N~~omination ~~e~~Committee for Chancellor shall determine its own procedures and shall select its chair from among the five members of the committee.

(d) Duties and Powers

(i) To invite submissions for candidates for nomination for the position of Chancellor from members of Convocation. ~~in the Chancellor's last year of service~~ [alternate additional wording: of his or her first and second terms].

(ii) To review the submissions and select one name for presentation to ~~the~~ the Senate at the spring meeting prior to the expiry of the incumbent Chancellor's ~~term; or in the case of an unplanned vacancy at the next meeting of the Senate.~~ term; or in the case of an unplanned vacancy at the next meeting of the Senate. ~~last year of service~~ [alternate wording: first and second terms].

(iii) If the name of the proposed candidate in (ii) above is not accepted by the Senate, to put forward an alternative nomination no later than the next meeting of the Senate.

(iv) To determine if a Chancellor wishing to sit a second term should be recommended for reappointment.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BYLAWS SECTION V - without mark-up

2. Appointment or reappointment of Chancellor

Eligibility

- (a) Members of Senate are eligible to vote to appoint or reappoint the Chancellor.

Submission of Candidates for Nominations

- (a) The names of candidates for nomination to the position of Chancellor must be proposed in writing, endorsed by 7 members of Convocation, and submitted to the Secretary. The submission must include the written consent of the person being proposed.
- (b) Only persons who have been members of the Convocation for at least 10 years prior to the date for filing submissions are eligible to be appointed as Chancellor.

Appointment or reappointment

- (a) The Chancellor is required to advise if he or she is willing to serve a second term by June 30 in the second year of his or her first term.
- (b) If the current Chancellor is willing to be reappointed for a second term, the Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor will consider whether or not he or she should be recommended for reappointment. If the recommendation is for reappointment, the committee will recommend to Senate that the Chancellor be reappointed for a second term with no other nominations taken.
- (c) A call for nominations for Chancellor will be sent to Convocation on or before November 30 in the event:
- i) the Chancellor is not willing to serve a second term;
  - ii) the Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor does not recommend reappointment; or
  - iii) it is the final year of the Chancellor's second term.

In the event of a vacancy in the office of Chancellor, or if it is known there will be a vacancy in the academic year, a call for nominations for Chancellor will be sent to Convocation as soon as is reasonable.

- (d) The Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor will recommend one person to the Senate for appointment as Chancellor.
- (e) The nominee shall be appointed or reappointed by a majority vote at a duly constituted meeting of the Senate, on the recommendation of the Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor, in accordance with Section 17 of the Act.
- (f) If the nomination is not approved by a majority of those voting, then the Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor will be asked to put forward an alternative nomination at the next meeting of the Senate.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BYLAWS SECTION V - without mark-up

7. Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor

(a) Membership

In accordance with Section 17 of the *University of Saskatchewan Act 1995*, the committee shall be composed of three members of the Senate and two members of the Board. The Board shall be invited to nominate two persons. The members of the Senate shall be nominated by the Nominations Committee as follows:

- (i) The President, in his/her capacity as vice-chancellor and vice-chair of the Senate.
- (ii) Two members of the Senate who have been elected under Section 24(1)(b) or 24(1)(c) of the *Act*. (i.e. elected Senators) nominated by the Nominations Committee and elected annually by Senate.

(b) Term

The Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor will be struck in the spring of the second year of the Chancellor's term, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Chancellor, or if it is known there will be a vacancy in the academic year. Members' terms will coincide with the selection process for the Chancellor.

(c) Chair

The Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor shall determine its own procedures and shall select its chair from among the five members of the committee.

(d) Duties and Powers

- (i) To invite submissions for candidates for nomination for the position of Chancellor from members of Convocation.
- (ii) To review the submissions and select one name for presentation to the Senate at the spring meeting prior to the expiry of the incumbent Chancellor's term; or in the case of an unplanned vacancy at the next meeting of the Senate.
- (iii) If the name of the proposed candidate in (ii) above is not accepted by the Senate, to put forward an alternative nomination no later than the next meeting of the Senate.
- (iv) To determine if a Chancellor wishing to sit a second term should be recommended for reappointment.



## Report of the Senate Education Committee

---

### FOR INFORMATION

**PRESENTED BY:** Lenore Swystun, Chair  
Senate Education Committee

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Education Topics for April 2017 Meeting

#### BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The education committee is to provide at each Senate meeting an opportunity for education or exploration of issues relating to the university. This is to be done by first polling Senators and then consulting with the executive committee respecting formation of the agenda.

A request for topics was sent electronically to Senate members in January. The education committee met on March 6, 2017, and agreed to recommend the proposed topic and format to the Senate Executive Committee for its meeting of March 16, 2017.

#### Education Topic:

The education committee recommended, and Senate executive agreed, that Senate discuss technology used in education using several different meeting spaces with a different topic in each space. Senators will be drawn at random to attend one of these sessions at the Senate meeting.