

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN SENATE  
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2012  
9:30 AM, EXETER ROOM, MARQUIS HALL**

Present: Vera Pezer (chair), J., Alexander, S. Anand, F. Anderson, L. Ashley, B. Banda, E. Barber, R. Bhargava, S. Bird, E. Bourassa, D. Boyko, M. Buhr, I. Busch-Vishniac, L. Butler, L. Calvert, J. Cameron-Turley, H. Christensen, B. Cram, J. Crawford, A. Danyliw, M. Derdall, T. Downey, D. Dutchak, L. Ebel, B. Fairbairn, S. Finley, P. Flaten, R. Forbes, S. Fortugno, G. Fowler, R. Fyfe, K. Gerwing, T. Girardin, N. Glover, M. Moore (on behalf of S. Haines), J. Halmo, M. Hande, D. Hannah, D. Hill, J. Huyghebaert, L. Isinger, R. Isinger, T. Isnana, J. Jacobs, J. Jensen, J. Johnston, J. Jonsson, A. Kopp-McKay, R. Krismer, L. Lacoursiere, A. Lavoie, H. Magotiaux, R. McPherson, D. Mihalicz, J. Miller, F. Myers, E. Nelson, K. Ogilvie, E. Ohiozebau, E. Olfert, O. Panchuk, N. Prokopchuk, J. Pulfer, C. Reynolds, N. Robertson, C. Rodgers, K. Rooney, L. Schmidt, R. Schriml, D. Senecal, D. Spitzig, G. Stevens, G. Stewart, P. Stoicheff, P. Stroh, M. Stumborg, L. Swystun, D. Taras, D. Taylor, J. Walters, J. Wells, A. Whittles, J. Wood and Lea Pennock (secretary)

Regrets: D. Agema, K. Chad, D. Docken, B. Dubois, M. Emde, D. Freeman, L. Greenberg, G. Hansen, R. Harasymchuk, L. King, E. Korsberg, A. March, L. Martz, G. McCaffrey, P. McKercher, T. Molloy, D. Morgan, D. Pennock, F. Puckett, L. Qualtiere, L. Thibodeau, T. Turner, D. Uglem, G. Uswak, P. Vaidyanathan, T. Wiebe, V. Williamson, B. Zimmer.

1. Introduction of Senate members and report on Senate election outcomes

Chancellor Pezer welcomed members of Senate to the annual fall meeting, and called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. She expressed particular welcome to newly-elected Senate members as well as to the new President, Dr. Ilene Busch-Vishniac. The chancellor also drew members' attention to information circulated at the meeting from University Advancement, concerning their current campaign. Dr. Pezer invited members to introduce themselves, indicating their name and their category of membership on the Senate.

A group of students and concerned members of the community announced they were here to make their voices heard and to protest rising tuition; they indicated their general consensus is to reduce tuition fees because they believe education is a right, not a privilege and should not be privatized in the interest of the military industry complex, the nuclear industry, or any other corporate interest. Education, they chanted, should be for emancipation, not exploitation.

2. Adoption of the agenda

A member recalled that at the last meeting he had asked for an update on the Canadian Centre for Nuclear Innovation and was assured there would be one; the chancellor suggested that the member could raise this under 'business arising.'

Another member sought an explanation for why a motion she had put forward had not been included on the agenda. The secretary pointed out that the reasons have been provided in the agenda material as part of agenda item 10.

KRISMER/STROH: That the agenda be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Minutes of the meeting of April 21, 2012

The chancellor indicated that an amended set of minutes had been circulated at the door and explained why these were being provided. She referred to a number of amendments that had been suggested by Senate members in advance of the meeting and noted that some of these have been incorporated in the revision circulated at the door.

A member indicated she was one of the Senate members who contacted the secretary, and that she felt there were still inaccuracies contained in the revised minutes as circulated. One of these was the nature of the motions concerning Lockheed Martin that were rejected, as well as comments about the president's conduct. She feels that in order to represent an accurate reading it is important to incorporate some of the things that happened in the meeting and feels there are still some inaccuracies, including a comment about Lockheed Martin and the nature of the motions that were rejected as well as comments about a potential conflict of interest on the part of (then) President MacKinnon. She also indicated that she would make an effort to note when she is speaking for the record, and requested that this objection be recorded in the minutes.

HANDE/FINLEY: That item 4.1 of the minutes be revised to include wording submitted to the secretary and include the name of the individual who spoke and further detail about the president's response.

DEFEATED

HANDE/FINLEY: For item 12, that the minutes record that there was a question from Senator Hande regarding recusals, specifically whether the president and the chair of the board of governors recused themselves from the board's selection of the CCNI Board of Directors.

DEFEATED

HANDE/KRISMER: For item 12, that the minutes recording the discussion around Lockheed Martin be revised to remove the statement *that Lockheed Martin is focused on collaborating with the University of Saskatchewan on creating renewable energy options as this is untrue.*

In discussion of the motion above, a Senate member asked leave to introduce a statement to correct the minutes to clarify the actual nature and purpose of Lockheed-Martin; the chair ruled this would not be in order as the motion before the Senate (i.e., a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting), concerns what was said at that meeting and not

new information from today's meeting. Dean Barber then rose to inform Senate members that he would stand by the statement in the minutes as a record of what he actually said.

The motion was put to a vote and DEFEATED

HANDE/PULFER: To include under item 12 of the minutes Senator Fortugno's request for budget information for the Canadian Light Source.

DEFEATED

JOHNSON/EBEL: That the minutes of the meeting of April 21, 2012 be approved with the amendments circulated.

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

No further business was raised.

5. President's report

The chair invited Dr Busch-Vishniac to give her report; members welcomed the new president with applause. The president began her remarks with a comment of appreciation for the warmth of the welcome she has received in Saskatchewan.

Commending members to her written report, the president then indicated she would be devoting her remarks to the significance and meaning of the inclusion of the University of Saskatchewan, a year and a half ago, on the list of the most research-intensive universities in Canada.

Dr. Busch-Vishniac described the goal of the U15 as striving to be an influential presence among the world's top 100 universities, bringing the greatest minds to bear on the world's most profound challenges, and for fostering the capacity for Canadian universities to engage in groundbreaking scholarship and outstanding leadership. She described the membership of the U15 and the concerns raised by the executive heads about federal funding for national science programs, and other advocacy issues related to funding, research, and public policy. She explained that in addition to the executive heads' group there are also U15 groups for the Vice Presidents Academic, Vice Presidents Research and University Secretaries.

The president noted that the world's great universities often forge partnerships with the best in other countries. Being a member of the U15 gives our institution an opportunity to be visible both nationally and internationally—but it is important provincially too. Research and teaching interact with one another, and both have a relation to clinical service at institutions with medical schools. At the best hospitals you get the best clinicians and researchers. From a provincial perspective it is also hugely significant that the presence of a research intensive university has a profound impact on the

economy. Her own research and calculations demonstrate that the economic impact of research-intensive institutions is much greater than that for non-research intensive universities.

The president also explained why membership in the U15 matters to students, including the importance for student recruitment of being among a group of highly-regarded universities. Research-intensive universities tend to attract a diverse community of high achieving students, who benefit from contact with researchers. The flavour of the research trickles down to undergraduates and opens opportunities for them; graduating from a U15 university opens doors for our graduates and enhances the value of their degrees.

For the university itself, membership in the U15 gives us an opportunity to benchmark appropriately with our peers. To the extent that we have aspirations as an institution to continue to improve, we could do worse than to take what our peers are doing and give it a Saskatchewan 'flavour'.

The chair then invited questions.

A member who identified himself as a federal scientist at a research institution expressed concerns about the federal government's trend towards reducing its science capacity, and asked what advocacy efforts were being made in this regard. The president responded that this issue has not yet been raised by the executive heads since she began attending this group, but that she would be happy to raise it. She noted that the number of students graduating in science has not lessened, but since these students are not entering the federal civil service, there is less understanding within the public service, and the resultant compounding effect is a real problem.

A member noted the mention of an international minerals institute in the section on recent university research initiatives, and wondered which companies have pledged support. The chair agreed to pass this question along to Vice-president research Karen Chad for a response, since Dr. Chad was not able to be here. The member indicated she also had questions for Dr. Chad about Enterprise Saskatchewan and the new Centre for Nuclear Innovation.

A member rose to thank the president for her comments and to report that at the recent premier's luncheon for the Chamber of Commerce there was discussion of a province-wide labour market strategy. He expressed his view that this would be better led by universities than by government.

A member referred to the president's implicit assumption that success should be measured using economic indicators and suggested that most Senate members would be aware that increasingly (including at the UN), the legitimacy of economic indicators is being challenged because they fail to measure such factors as resource depletion and pollution, or to distinguish between things that are destructive and things that are positive. She pointed out that some Canadians and some universities are adopting alternative indicators such as happiness indicators. The president clarified that the economic figures she was quoting represent dollars spent by universities directly in each

region on student financial aid, construction, purchase of equipment, salaries etc., and that when she talks about contributions to the GDP she is defining the universities' role very narrowly. She characterized the university as a whole, on the other hand, as 'exquisitely broad' in the way it covers disciplines and indeed there are individuals on the University of Saskatchewan campus who are very interested in matters of public policy and in the kind of indicators referenced by the senator.

A member commended the acting Vice-provost for teaching and learning and members of the Centre for Continuing and Distance Education for the work they are doing in distributed learning. He reported very positive feedback from families and parents and he urged the university to continue with the direction it is going, including moving into the north and forging partnerships with Aboriginal communities. He pointed out that half of our province geographically lies north of Prince Albert.

#### 6. Report on undergraduate student activities

USSU President Jared Brown presented his report on behalf of the Undergraduate Students' Union.

Mr. Brown reported on the work his executive has been doing getting ready for the academic year and becoming knowledgeable about their positions. As president he has been familiarizing himself with the Board of Governors, and has been involved in such initiatives as the Art in Place Riel project, the mayoral forum, and getting to know his colleagues and other university officials. Vice-president Kanyemba has been working with the University Learning Centre on experiential learning projects for undergraduates and has plans to link undergraduates with research labs and organizations where they can ameliorate their academic experience by applying their classroom skills and building their resumes. Vice-president Werenka has been hard at work on events such as Speed Friending, the mayoral debate, We Are Treaty People week, International Education week, and Fair Trade day on campus. Vice-president Heidel has consolidated resources and information relating to clubs on campus into a campus groups guide, reduced the time it takes for clubs to ratify from two weeks to less than two days, provided campus clubs with more opportunities to recruit members during welcome week, revitalized the Association of College Presidents, and has done a lot of work on the summer bus pass and forthcoming referendum.

The USSU has been in negotiation with the city to establish a summer U-PASS and students will be going to a referendum in mid November. On the last day of the referendum, Nov 15, the USSU will have its AGM. They recently held elections and moved to elect 10 members to Council, but only were able to elect 8. Four student senators were also elected and are here today. The elections led to realization of the need to fix some policy issues to ensure a full slate of members.

In partnership with Dr. J. Garcea, the USSU has taken on a student from the political studies department to do research on the idea of a social justice centre.

The chair invited members to ask questions; there were no questions.

7. Report on graduate student activities

Ehimai Ohiozebau, President of the Graduate Students Association, presented his report on behalf of the Graduate Students' Association.

Mr. Ohiozebau conveyed his pleasure at being a student at the University of Saskatchewan and told Senate he has been very impressed with the culture of student engagement and is excited about the third integrated plan. He led members through a series of slides outlining the following:

1. the GSA's mission statement:
  - to ensure graduate students have access to quality services that support their academic success;
  - to advocate for the unique needs and concerns of graduate students on and off campus;
  - to build a cohesive graduate student community.
2. its membership:
  - membership is all graduate students,
  - course council is made up of nominees from graduate members;
  - executive council is made up of 6 positions including an Aboriginal liaison officer.
3. its services, including
  - a graduate student housing project;
  - workshops and seminars, including planned monthly forums on professions in various sectors;
  - advocacy of such issues as sustainability and inclusion of graduates in the government's graduate retention program;
  - distribution of bursary assistance to students with financial needs;
  - health and dental plan;
  - travel assistance for conferences;
  - discount programs;
  - orientation for new members;
  - handbook for graduate students;
  - social activities;
  - negotiation with Saskatoon transit for a graduate student UPASS.

The chair invited members to ask questions, there were no questions.

8. Report on Non-academic Student Discipline Cases for 2011/2012

This report was presented by the university secretary and was received for information.

A member, who asked that her question be part of the official record for the meeting, *asked what was the nature of the cases, and why did one case go to Alternative Dispute Resolution while the rest were sent to the Senate Hearing Board.* The secretary responded that while the need to protect students' privacy

prevents her commenting on the particulars of any case, the kind of activities that came forward this year would include students being accused of harassment, causing disruption in classrooms, destroying or stealing property, and fraud. She indicated that in some years a greater proportion of cases had been sent to ADR. This year, only one went this route. The considerations she takes into account in deciding whether or not to send something to ADR (as outlined in section IV.2.i of the procedures) include such factors as the nature of the offense, the seriousness of the charge, the apparent willingness of both parties to enter into a consensual process, and whether there have been previous attempts to resolve the matter by alternative means.

A student member commended Campus Safety for its recent action in sending advisories out to notify members of campus when there has been an incident of violence on campus. The Associate Vice-president for Student Affairs David Hannah confirmed that there is a new communications protocol for reporting on incidents of violence. The previous process had administrators making a determination based on the facts of the situation whether it was thought there was a continuing risk. It became clear that the community does not want to leave that up to the discretion of the administration but to allow members to decide for themselves whether there is a risk.

A member noted that some of the discipline is fairly severe, and wondered what kind of sanctions relate to what kinds of offenses, and asked whether there is an appeal process. The secretary confirmed that in determining sanctions, appeal boards generally look for opportunities to educate rather than to punish, and also that they review prior penalties for similar offenses to ensure consistency. Both the complainant and the respondent are entitled to appeal on grounds outlined in section IV.7 of the regulations.

9. Report of the *ad hoc* Committee to Review Standards of Student Conduct in Non Academic Matters

This report was presented by David Hannah, Associate Vice-president for Student Affairs and chair of the *ad hoc* committee. The chair invited discussion of the document.

A member who asked that her questions be recorded for the minutes indicated that she lives out of town and did not receive her agenda until this week, and therefore had a chance to review the current standards just yesterday. She wondered whether there would be a possibility to defer discussion of this item so that members could compare the two versions more closely. The chancellor invited Dr. Hannah to comment verbally on the nature and extent of the differences between the document being presented today and the one approved by Senate in 2008. Dr. Hannah drew members' attention to pp. 52 and 53 of the agenda materials, where these changes are summarized.

A member suggested that the motion be reworded so that 'approved effective October 20, 2012' be amended to 'approved for any complaints made after October 20,2012.' The mover and seconder both agreed to consider this a friendly amendment.

A member referenced Section III, Expectations for Student Conduct, and expressed concern that the inclusion of ‘disrupts or threatens to disrupt any of the activities of the University’ could put students, *such as the ones who had staged a demonstration earlier in today’s meeting*, in danger of being accused of misconduct for legitimate exercise of their right to protest. *The chair responded to assure the member that they had no intention of disciplining any students for such disruptive actions.* Dr. Hannah responded that these regulations are complaint-driven, and also pointed to the guiding principle that states clearly that ‘students have the right to express their views and to test and challenge ideas, provided they do so within the law and in a peaceful and non-threatening manner that does not disrupt the welfare and proper functioning of the university.’ He also indicated that this definition has not changed from the version that was approved by Senate in 2008. A student member spoke in favour of the way the sanctions have been applied in the past 4 years, and in favour of the amendments. Another member referenced recent stories in the media about the prevalence of bullying in schools and indicated that bullying does not appear in the list of examples of activities that constitute breaches of the standard.

HILL/JOHNSON to amend the definition of misconduct in the Standard for Student Conduct to include ‘bullying’ among the list of violations of the standard.

CARRIED

HANDE/MILLER: To defer consideration of this item to the next meeting.

DEFEATED

SCHMIDT/STEVENS: That the *Standard of Student Conduct in Non-Academic Matters and Regulations and Procedures for Resolution of Complaints and Appeals*, as presented in the agenda materials and further revised at this meeting, be approved for any complaints made after October 20, 2012.

CARRIED

10. Senate Executive Committee

This report was presented by Vera Pezer, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee.

A member rose to identify herself as one of those who put forward motions for the agenda to the Executive Committee. She asked that it be noted for the record that her blog [www.sandrafinley.ca](http://www.sandrafinley.ca) contains information about Lockheed Martin Corporation and a copy of the information she had intended to submit with this agenda item. She invited any Senate members who want additional information about what Lockheed-Martin is and about ‘greenwashing’ to visit this site.

Another member asked that her objection be recorded in the minutes to the Executive Committee’s decision that this matter had been sufficiently discussed at the last meeting in April. She pointed out that the matter was not on the agenda of that meeting and had come up during question period.



Another member identified himself as one of the two members to submit the motion on dispute resolution at the university. He expressed the view that sometimes all of the dispute resolution mechanisms in place fail for one reason or another, and that when those mechanisms fail, the only recourse is to the courts of the province of Saskatchewan, which can be extremely expensive. The motion, he said, was an attempt to have at the highest level a finding and binding arbitration that both parties would accept. He directed members of Senate to s. 23 of the *University of Saskatchewan Act 1995*, the section that outlines the powers of the Senate, and in particular to subsections, (o) and (t), which empower the senate to recommend to the board or the council any matters the senate considers necessary to promote the interests of the university, and to do any other thing that the senate considers necessary, incidental or conducive to exercising its powers. The member read these sections aloud. He asked in the future when considering motions at the executive committee, the chair consider these two sections. He estimated that the amount of money spent on dispute resolution at the university would be on the order of \$3-\$4M and that is too much to spend.

Another member objected to the executive committee's having declined to place the second motion on the agenda on the basis that they believe the motion was submitted "primarily for the purpose of promoting general economic, political, racial, religious, social or similar causes unrelated to the activities of the University". She expressed the view that this clause is too restrictive given the broad interests of a university, and can be used as a means of silencing minority groups.

11. Senate Nominations Committee Report

Joy Crawford, a member of the committee, presented this item for information on behalf of the chair.

12. Report of Task Force to Review Senate Bylaws

This update was presented by Donna Taylor, Chair of the Task Force to Review Senate Bylaws. Ms. Taylor indicated that the committee has just had its third meeting and hopes to have a report with recommendations at the next meeting.

A member asked that it be recorded in the minutes that she is struck by the absence in the bylaw review of a meaningful mechanism for the general Senate body to provide input, and asked how much time Senate will be given to review the revisions that are being proposed in advance of the next meeting.

Ms. Taylor indicated that the draft revisions will go out with the agenda package in advance of the Senate meeting, and took note of the request for adequate time to review. She also noted that one of the reasons for bringing the report to Senate today is to invite input as the committee goes about its work, and indicated that the committee would be more than willing to receive suggestions for revisions from any Senate member between this meeting and the next.

13. Report of the Round Table on Outreach and Engagement

#### 14. Report on Outreach and Engagement

These two items were presented together by Keith Carlson, Special Advisor on Outreach and Engagement. Professor Carlson described the kind of initiatives that are already underway to promote engagement with the university's broader community, and the plans for even more activity in this area. A copy of his presentation is appended to the minutes as Appendix A.

A member observed that the university's choice of external partners affects everything from curriculum to research, and asked what the process is for choosing those external partners and research activities. Dr. Carlson responded that this is really shaped by individual disciplines and faculty members, though his office hopes to play a role in helping to coordinate and align the initiatives of individual departments and researchers with college and university priorities. A member asked whether one of the external partners is a nuclear waste management organization; Professor Carlson indicated that he does not know whether this is the case or not as there is as yet no centralized list of all of the research partnerships undertaken by university members.

A member referenced the First Nations and Métis engagement office at English River, and expressed concern about the English River First Nation's potential involvement in high level nuclear waste management. She said she understood the new Centre for Nuclear Innovation on campus has a mandate for high level waste storage and research and wondered whether this is a Trojan horse for the English River First Nation. Dr. Carlson indicated he was unaware of any such connection.

#### 15. Item from University Council

##### 15.1 Change in Admission Qualifications for the College of Medicine for out-of-province residents

This item has been approved by University Council and is being brought to Senate for confirmation in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

PULFER/MILLER: To defer the motion for a full year.

DEFEATED

CRAWFORD/BOURASSA: That Senate confirm the proposal from the College of Medicine to change the admission qualifications for out-of-province residents, effective for 2013 admissions.

CARRIED

#### 16. Policy Oversight Committee Report

This report was received for information.

Asking that her question be recorded for the minutes, a member asked about the nature of the revisions being contemplated in the Conflict of Interest policy. The secretary indicated that all of the university's policies undergo periodic review and that one of the goals of the policy oversight committee is to combine related policies where possible; the conflict of interest policy is likely to be revised to roll in and incorporate other existing policies on external directorships and on hiring of family members; it will likely be retitled the policy on 'conflict of interest and conflict of commitment.'

Another member asked what changes are being contemplated for the seniors' tuition waiver; the secretary explained that like the example just discussed, the change relates to combining two separate policies—the policy on tuition and the seniors tuition waiver—into one general tuition policy rather than having two separate policies. As far as she is aware there is no change in the intent or substance of the policy being contemplated at this time.

17. Presentations and group discussions on the University beyond the current planning horizon: what kind of University do we want to have in 10 – 20 years?

President Ilene Busch-Vishniac presented the discussion topic with reference to the strategic goals and plans of the institution. She made comments on each of the themes in the Integrated Plan—Knowledge Creation, Aboriginal Engagement, Innovation in Programs, and Culture and Community.

Members then broke into six discussion groups to respond to 3 questions posed by the president:

1. What are we doing particularly well at the U of S?
2. What are we doing not so well?
3. Where should we be as an institution 10 or 20 years out?

The facilitators for the 6 groups reported out; the reports are included as Appendix B.

18. Other business

The chancellor invited members to sign a card to congratulate Shirley Haines on her induction into the Saskatoon Women's Hall of Fame.

She also reminded members of the sign-up sheets for Senate committees at the registration desk and asked any interested members to signal their interest.

A member asked for an update on the Canadian Centre for Nuclear Innovation. Provost Fairbairn responded and suggested a written report could be prepared by Vice-president Chad for a future Senate meeting, but in the meantime he could provide a few comments. He noted that the incorporation of the CCNI as a Type C not-for-profit subsidiary of the University of Saskatchewan occurred less than year ago (in December 2011). The centre is functioning with an interim board of directors and an interim director. It is not intended as a centre that will conduct its own research or have its own laboratories but rather will exist as a funding base and will invite research proposals. The call for proposals has not yet been announced. Development of the CCNI is interlinked with

other projects such as the development of a cyclotron and PET-CT scanner related to use of isotopes for diagnostic purposes in health care. As of this month the interim director of the centre has moved into offices on campus and the Board of Governors of the university renamed the centre as the Sylvia Fedoruk CCNI just earlier this month.

Another member rose to give accolades to the university on behalf of the provincial council of women. Observing that there are women in attendance at this meeting in every position that really counts at the university, she congratulated the institution on helping women to break the glass ceiling.

#### 19. Question Period

Chancellor Pezer invited any further questions before the meeting closed.

A member raised a question that she indicated had also been raised at the last meeting, about the budget of the synchrotron and how it relates to the university's budget. Greg Fowler, acting Vice-president for Finance and Resources, indicated that the synchrotron's budget comes partly from the university but mostly from federal and provincial sources.

Another member requested that there be a future report to Senate on the Institute for Water Security and the recent appointment of a head for that institute. She pointed out that water is of very basic and vital interest to this province and to the world, and that members of Senate would like to hear more about it and about what part our university can play in solving the world's water problems.

A member asked whether the statement on p. 11 of the agenda material is accurate in stating that the government of Saskatchewan has been asked to change the Act so that member of the Senate on the board could serve a third term; she had understood this request was made only on an exception basis relating to the term of one of the current Senate nominees to the board. The chancellor confirmed that in the spring of 2010, Senate approved a motion to authorize the university's administration to seek changes to the Act that would allow a third term for the senate representatives on the board. These changes have been requested but have not yet been enacted in legislation. Another member noted that since the term of a member of Senate is only 6 years, if a Senate appointee to the board sat for 9 years this could not coincide with a Senate term. The chancellor noted that the senate appointee to the board of governors is not necessarily—and in fact has not usually been—a member of Senate during their term on the board. In fact, it would be almost impossible to line up these terms, since in order to do so an individual would have to become a member of Senate and a Senate nominee to the Board at the same time.

Prior to asking for adjournment, the Chancellor made two announcements. The first related to convocation, which occurs on October 27 at TCU Place. At the first ceremony, the new president will be installed and in the afternoon the university will be presenting an honorary degree to Douglas Cardinal. The second announcement was a surprise presentation of flowers to outgoing university secretary Lea Pennock and to outgoing executive assistant Norma McBain, both of whom will retire prior to the next Senate meeting.

20. Adjournment and next meeting of Senate

The meeting adjourned at 2:53 p.m. Next meeting is Saturday, April 20, 2013.

Appendix A – presentation on Outreach and Engagement

## Appendix B: Reports from Break-out groups

### Group One (Carol Rodgers)

*What we're doing well* – making our presence as a university known; wonderful branding; establishing ourselves in strong programs, particularly those that interact with the environment; community engagement (need to develop further); student experience and great work on areas such as residences, Marquis Hall, Place Riel and our facilities.

*What we're not doing so well* – do more on becoming more flexible in programs, how and when they are offered, students working across colleges more easily, transferability between programs, developing and nurturing shared traditions; become more research intensive; internal collaboration; can still do better in student advising.

*Where we should seek to be 10-20 years out* – be more distinctive and focused in signature areas; graduate students with a breadth of experience and exposure; embrace diversity and be representative of the work force and the province; First Nations students, staff and faculty need to have a presence; we are all treaty people; finances should not be a barrier.

### Group Two (Mary Buhr)

*What we're doing well* – Planning ahead in a thoughtful way; moving forward in chosen areas; implementing interdisciplinary schools; recognized as a trusted source of information and authority in the country; research and producing highly trained people recognized all around the world and sought after and with a great work ethic; improving the student experience, e.g. study abroad.

*What we're not doing so well* – we still have a relatively small percentage of students involved in the broader community; still not necessarily producing graduates who are producing employers' needs (e.g. more teachers and doctors); need to engage alumni in sharing work and life experiences so students can recognize the choices they have; we are not really good at getting our story out and having the public advocate on our behalf to the government; celebrate our successes more and speak out about the kind of things we are doing; we don't use technology nearly as well as we could be using it, particularly to get our message out and reach out to people wherever they are geographically; not necessarily providing as good a student experience as we could; not as culturally diverse as we should be.

*Where we should seek to be 10-20 years out* – we should be culturally diverse, should represent the various communities of the province and different abilities; indigenizing the education we offer; should be recognized as a leader in the quality of the learning experience we offer; more experiential learning and integration with the community; setting outcomes for what we want our graduates to be; reaching a greater percentage of people in all areas of the province; build on our personal community experience and connections and celebrate these; consider whether we should be a generalist or specialist institution—perhaps specialize in a fewer number of areas.

### Group Three (Sanjeev Anand)

*What we're doing well-* produce a great student experience through inclusive communities, orientation, Huskies games, student events, lectures and seminars from well-known people; attract rural students and engage with rural communities; a high level of collegiality for various reasons including the beauty of our campus; developing partnerships with the business community; being humble and producing well-rounded

graduates; producing a particularly positive attitude and atmosphere; have garnered great success at producing strong evidence-based results, e.g. through student competitions; we let results speak for themselves; participating in distance learning initiatives such as in our Nursing program; great faculty support for students; large projects such as the synchrotron; recognized implications for resource extraction better than most universities.

*What we're not doing so well* – coordinate our external events well around student schedules; are we open enough for business internationally and putting the U of S brand out internationally; it's not actually tuition that is the problem but need to communicate better regarding tuition and the link between tuition and program quality; not promoting our successes as well as we could be; could do a better job connecting with our alumni; should be engaging in more spinoff initiatives and encouraging entrepreneurship; retaining graduates in the province; should be more careful about who we are partnering with and think about the implication of our partnerships.

*Where we should seek to be 10-20 years out:* maintain the balance between social and environmental responsibility and economic development.

#### Group Four (Peter Stoicheff)

*What we're doing well* – being humble; our relatively small size has been a positive characteristic particularly for rural students; prepare students well for specific professions; increasingly the university is increasingly consultative with grassroots communities particularly in the area of research.

*What we're not doing so well* – many different kinds of points made here around programs, research, budgets. We are behind the curve on deferred maintenance and can't afford to be; need to look at more and alternative power sources; more and alternative ways of welcoming Aboriginal students; could be doing better at offering ways of self-motivation for attending and being successful at university for Aboriginal students; need to better help students who don't know what they want to do; need to expose those students to different interdisciplinary ways of thinking and give them opportunities to work on real-world problems; we are not at the cutting edge of new learning technologies and we need to be; funding should not go disproportionately to administrative activities as it appears to be; it is overly onerous to get things going—overly committee'd and overly red-taped.

*Where we should seek to be 10-20 years out* - operate within our budgets, enlarge endowments, creative in all we do; encourage flexibility; preparing students for professions that don't exist now; not career-specific training so much as transferable skills. Should be more adept at distributed learning; go out to students where they are; train students to work on the most pressing problems facing the world, e.g. expose students to real-world problems and ask them through their education to consider solutions; need to be less siloed, given the complexity of problems in the real world; value pure and not just applied research; should be preparing students to be good citizens; be a leader in renewable energy through our research and innovation.

#### Group Five (Daphne Taras)

*What we're doing well* – research; an excellent relationship with the city; beautiful infrastructure and architecture; we are thought to be open-minded and open to opportunities; powerful reputation within the province; not an ivory tower (premier universities are rarely so well integrated into the community); good relationships with rural communities; the university goes out of its way to include students in governance



and the life of the university; a friendly province; the campus is an unusual property in that it goes all the way from dairy cows to a synchrotron—an incredible range; outreach in the north and rural communities; some progress but not nearly enough with Aboriginal communities; residences.

*What we're not doing so well* – would be nice if people from adjacent provinces stopped here rather than taking their students to Ontario; not doing so well in explaining what the Senate is and why it exists—could be addressed through RACs; more work needs to be done in Aboriginal inclusion; need to be better at promoting ourselves; proud of our research but not integrating clinical practice well into research; don't want people to feel disconnected from the university at the expense of seeking research success; parking; child care; capacity of the university to borrow and watch out for political interference and growth of debt repayment problems.

*Where we should seek to be 10-20 years out* – didn't get to this question.

#### Group Six (Russ Isinger)

*What we're doing well* – the integrated planning process, and matching our vision to resources; not change averse and can change fairly quickly by university standards; show leadership in the province and elsewhere and provide leaders; focused on recruitment and retention and are attracting more Aboriginal, out of province and international students; we care about the areas outside of Saskatoon and emphasize distance education; leveraging research for real-world and commercial applications.

*What we're not doing so well* – need to engage even more with rural and border areas; with our francophone and Aboriginal communities; disciplines are too siloed; need to review our program areas and redirect resources; pursue the path we are on with our medical school; better success rates; leverage our relationships with other PSEs in Saskatchewan such as SIAST—they are not our competitors but could be our partners.

*Where we should seek to be 10-20 years out:* leverage technology so students can cross institutions; spin out technology from our research; more emphasis on continuing education; Aboriginal graduates in proportion to their population; partner with external partners; leading medical doctoral institution and a destination choice; broaden our income base to weather economic downturns; parking will no longer be an issue.