

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Opening Remarks

The chair noted that we are on Treaty Six land and welcomed everyone in Cree and English. He explained that he will not be sitting for a second term and provided the reasons for his decision. He noted a number of the Indigenization efforts that have begun during his three years as chancellor and that the future is positive for these works. The university is seen as a monument of tolerance and demonstrates how to work together for positive change. The chancellor expressed that he is very proud of the U of S, and committed to being an ambassador for the university for all time.

Introductions were then made by everyone present.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

A senator requested that agenda items 13.1 and 13.2 under “Other Business” be prioritized on the agenda to appear before item 11.1 “Presentation – Global Institute for Food Security”.

HANDE/BINNIE: That the agenda be amended so items 13.1 and 13.2 be moved ahead of item 11.1

DEFEATED

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

CARRIED

3. Minutes of the Meeting of October 17, 2015

A senator asked for an update on the Responsible Conduct of Research policy. Vice-president research, Dr. Karen Chad, replied that there was a question at the previous Senate meeting about Dr. Peter Phillips, professor in the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, and an article regarding impact on GMO research, “Economic Consequences of Regulations of GM Crops”. Dr. Chad explained that the Genetic Literacy Project is part of the Science Library Project, a 501(c)(3) non-profit tax exempt corporation and does not receive funding from corporations. There are two U of S policies that would be invoked by accusations against Dr. Phillips: the Responsible Conduct of Research policy, which aligns with Tri-Council ethics and other international ethics, and the Conflict of Interest Policy. Dr. Chad advised that after reviewing these policies, and those of other organizations in which the University is aligned, she found no wrongdoing by Dr. Phillips. There was no funding or other support provided to him inappropriately and the article could not be considered commissioned. Given this there was no obligation, even under national or international guidelines for him to say that he was asked to pen an article. The article in question was consistent with other articles written by Dr. Phillips. It was not seen nor edited by Monsanto or other organizations prior to publication. In Dr. Chad’s opinion it does not matter who asked him to write the article. It was placed on a public forum and any person, or corporation, is free to make use of the material with confirmation of

authorship. Some may interpret that the article is contrary to university policy in that it was detrimental to the University but this gets to the hub of academic freedom, which the University strongly upholds.

Senator Mihalicz requested that the following language be added to the minutes: "A Senate member told Chancellor Favel there are Indigenous Elders and scientists who would disagree with much of what Neil Alexander said, and asked when senators can expect the Executive Committee to bring in a speaker to balance the information Mr. Alexander presented. The chancellor directed the Senate member to write a letter to the Senate executive committee."

PEZER/KRISMER: That the minutes of the meeting of October 17, 2015 be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. Business from the Minutes

Patti McDougall, vice-provost teaching and learning, provided an update on the Sexual Assault Prevention policy. She noted that the companion procedures are in the final stages of vetting and have been in use over the past six months. She added there is also a newly redesigned website presence.

Dr. McDougall reported the procedures are within her responsibility and that of Cheryl Carver, associate vice-president of human resources. They will continue to take comments on the process and the procedures as the document is dynamic. She noted the procedures will have three sections: finding and getting help, going on the official record, and making a complaint. The university is working towards the launch of a safety app. Regarding training, the university will be moving towards disclosures, education and prevention to create a culture of consent and to encourage bystander intervention. Dr. McDougall also reported that she was working with a committee to revise the Non-Academic Misconduct Procedures.

A senator asked if any money was received to support the policy. Dr. McDougall replied that no money was requested, but if required she will request it from the provost.

A senator noted concerns around student safety and that students require assistance through an ombudsman office and recommended such an office be available. She also requested information on how faculty will be disciplined through this process. Dr. McDougall replied that the collective agreements as well as Human Resources practices address how to discipline faculty and staff on campus.

A senator expressed her concern with the presentation by Neil Alexander, executive director of the Sylvia Fedoruk Canadian Centre for Nuclear Initiatives at last fall's Senate meeting and proposed the following motion:

MIHALICZ/LEE: That Candyce Paul of English River First Nations now be heard.

DEFEATED For 20/Against 30.

Following the vote, a protest was brought by the Committee for Future Generations. In response Chancellor Favel invited Candyce Paul to speak at the university at another time when students would be able to attend, and noted that senators will be invited to that meeting.

The chancellor shared his personal experience noting that when he first started at the University of Saskatchewan in 1982 there were 40 Aboriginal students and now there are 2000; and the University has come a long way in how it supports Indigenous students.

A senator asked why Senate executive committee did not approve Candyce Paul to speak at Senate following the senator's written request. She was informed that this was a decision of the Senate executive committee and that Ms. Paul has been invited to speak and a date will be provided by the end of the Senate meeting.

The protestors were asked to leave. The Senate meeting was recessed for fifteen minutes and reconvened at 10 a.m.

5. President's Report

President Stoicheff shared that he joined the university in 1986, and prior to becoming president he served the university in a number of roles, first as an English professor and most recently as dean of the College of Arts and Science. He explained that he really wanted to be president of this University and only this University.

Over the past six months as president a number of things have been confirmed for him, one of which is that the University has an enormous impact on this city, province, country and increasingly globally. Saskatchewan people believe the University offers students a high quality of education - 89% of those surveyed believe our teaching and research is beneficial to the community. Based on an economic impact study conducted recently, 62,000 people in Saskatchewan earned their post-secondary degrees at the U of S; we generate \$1.2B dollars in GDP for the whole province which is 1.5% of the province's GDP; we are one of Saskatchewan's largest employers - employing over 6200 people full time or part time; and our per capita impact on the region ranks first or second of all universities of the country. The president concluded that the university provides an enormous value and he continues to bring that message to as many members of the provincial government that he can.

The president drew attention to recent research successes at the university, including being one of five universities to receive a Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF) grant worth over \$35 M (this was the largest federal funding of research ever mounted in Canada); and two U of S researchers received two of thirteen NSERC Create grants which support training of teams of highly qualified students and post-docs - one in the department of Computer Science and the other in the department of Physics and Engineering Physics.

The president noted that the Senate Executive committee meeting where today's agenda was considered was chaired by him, rather than the chancellor who was unable to make the meeting. At that meeting it was decided that the president's report should include information about the indigenization of the university. President Stoicheff advised that the role of this university is to ask questions about fine arts, humanities, social sciences, professions and sciences, and based on what we learn we should be informing our citizens, stakeholders, students and each other, and the things which we are learning we should be able to innovate with, and to indigenize. The president noted that he sees the role of the president is to change the conversation and what he would love to see changed is indigenization. He noted that if it is not us, who is going to change that conversation in this province and if it is not now, after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) Calls to Action with specific items addressed to the post-secondary sector, when will it be.

President Stoicheff provided the following information about Indigenization at the university: the number of undergrad Aboriginal students increased by 8% over the past five years, when the overall student population increased by 2.5%; the number of first time direct entry Aboriginal students is up 4% over last year. At the university we are talking about issues that will take more than a generation to solve – but we are moving in the right direction. Over last five years the percentage of our undergraduate students graduating who are Aboriginal has increased from 8.3% to 11%; and graduating graduate students who are Aboriginal has increased from 4% to 5.7%. We are not yet successful and we will only know we are successful when Aboriginals in our communities tell us we are successful.

The president also explained that we need to be the best place we can possibly be for Aboriginal students and their communities and this will take a lot of time. All Canadian universities are working on this, and we need to be a leader – but it is not a contest. President Stoicheff listed what the U of S is doing – with the intent not to be divisive but to build reconciliation:

- Created a successful first year transition programming
- Held the forum on building reconciliation in November 2015 with Aboriginal leaders and university leaders from across the country
- Created a language certificate, and a new program in law
- University Council approved a motion to have Aboriginal content in all programs
- Ceremonies and powwows are held and we have an Indigenous week
- With the assistance of many elders a number of Aboriginal symbols have been identified to be used in our promotion and other materials
- Gordon Oakes Red Bear Student Centre was opened
- We have a director of Aboriginal Initiatives and a director of an Aboriginal Student Centre and we are designing a Vice-Provost, Indigenous Engagement position –which is a coordinating position.
- The chancellor and president are working on designing an Elders Advisory Council which will be of enormous benefit to all on Campus. We have developed protocol language.
- Thirteen new Aboriginal faculty members have been hired since July 2013
- Developed the Aboriginal Career Start Program that welcomes and creates work for Aboriginal employees
- Signed on for the Memorandum of Understanding with the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation in Winnipeg to provide access to the archive of material gathered by the TRC
- Will have a follow-up forum internally from our Building Reconciliation forum.

A senator acknowledged and thanked Registrar Russ Isinger and USSU President Jack Saddleback for their work in making university application forms gender neutral and offered a suggestion for consideration that the data collection in research projects also be gender neutral.

A senator noted that the Indigenous people have some good models that our non-Indigenous population would benefit from, such as the way disputes are handled in communities, and that making the university a place where Indigenous people can reach their potential is important; but also noted that the term, indigenization, applies to the rest of the university community and defines those values that are missing in the dominant society and that can be found in the culture of First Nations people. The senator asked whether this was behind the president's words. The president confirmed that this is what he is saying and what everyone is trying to do. He invited the senator to raise this point again during the breakout sessions when discussing the vision, mission and values statement.

A senator noted that the provincial government provided \$30 M to the U of S to establish the Sylvia Fedoruk Canadian Centre for Nuclear Innovation and asked whether that funding contained a condition that the U of S promote the nuclear agenda. In response, the president agreed that the question deserves to be asked and that this university is extremely serious about the fact that any contract it signs for research funding allows for academic freedom – such that researchers can pursue what they want and the money is not provided on a condition of a certain finding.

An Aboriginal senator noted that coming from indigenization of the north – he was disappointed not to see the discussion about uranium and would like to see it in the future. He explained that he did not want to see the universities owning Aboriginal knowledge, such as knowledge in relation to medicine or their own ecological knowledge. The rights have to be left with the communities and the people who have passed on that knowledge. He stated that the university has to develop a policy on how that knowledge will be recognized and respected and asked how he could be convinced that the knowledge that will be shared will be saved and the true owners will be recognized and respected. 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 Métis 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.

Chancellor Favel also responded, advising that he is working with the president to set up an Elders Council – a core group of elders to be liaisons to Indigenous communities including the Dene community and asked the senator to help with that, given his language skills. They will also ask Cree, Dakota, Métis and other elders to work on an agreement of what and how to share. We saw this morning that this is not an easy path. Chancellor Favel noted that none of the university people he works with have a bad agenda and he thinks they are doing a good job. Chancellor Favel also announced that September 16, 2016 is the date that Candyce Paul is invited to speak at the university.

A senator raised a point of order seeking clarification regarding when it is appropriate to use the prerogative of the chair. The chair answered that he was trying to honour the approved agenda.

6. Report on Undergraduate Student Activities

Jack Saddleback, USSU president, advised that the year was a collaborative one and the USSU worked closely with the GSA on a number of initiatives, such as missing and murdered Indigenous women, the federal and provincial elections, and others. Regarding Indigenous content -- on November 19, 2015 the University Student Council passed a unanimous motion to have Indigenous content in all programs at the university and then called on University Council to implement this. He congratulated the chancellor and president for the Building Reconciliation forum as he heard a lot of positive responses from others across Canada and in the US. He announced that the university now has a two-spirit scholarship and in ways such as this we are peeling back layers of marginalization.

Mr. Saddleback advised that there is a lot of good work happening at the university from great leaders. He was proud to say that he was part of this institution and proud to work with Patti

McDougall and others in administration. Our auspicious chancellor has played a vital role in this work and he stated that the student body is standing behind the chancellor and really appreciated his leadership and all that he has done. He acknowledged that he would not be here at the University of Saskatchewan if it was not for the hard work of Chancellor Blaine Favel – as he can feel welcome at the university as a Cree, transsexual, two-spirit man.

7. Report on Graduate Student Activities

Rajat Chakravarty, GSA president, explained that many of the GSA executive ran for election on a platform for transparency and governance reform – which they were able to improve in leaps and bounds. The GSA also operated strongly in the area of student wellness with involvement in intramural sports events as the GSA Guppies; and hosting health chats once a month where such things as stress, mental health, and relationship with supervisors were addressed. The Graduate Student Achievement Week was held again this year– with many people participating in the three-minute thesis and GSA Gala. The GSA participated in the opening of the Gordon Oakes Red Bear student centre which is becoming a desirable venue to have events and has created a lot of engagement with Aboriginal issues. The GSA supported the reintroduction of a Campus Legal Services Office where students from the College of Law assist students. Social initiatives were also hosted, such as a non-violent communication workshop and a positive space workshop. They also focused on the economic wellness of graduate students and now have an emergency loans program of \$10,000 that students can access. Regarding tuition and international tuition the GSA is attempting to learn what the graduate students think the issues are and the policies that the university follows. Mr. Chakravarty noted that he needed responses from 300 graduate students to get a representative view of 3000 students with 95% accuracy – and it has been difficult to get students to speak so that is ongoing work.

8. Report on Board of Governors Activities

Joy Crawford advised that she and Daphne Arnason, who was also present, were the senate-elected members on the Board of Governors. Ms. Crawford provided a summary of the work done by the Board since the last Senate meeting. Board of Governors were kept apprised of the president's transition activities, such as meetings with colleges and schools and advancing the president with the external community. In the area of finance and investment, the Board received the quarterly update on university finances indicating revenues were down from last year due to lower than expected government funding and investment returns. The board discussed the recent one-time adjustment to the university's 2015/16 government grant. Board has approved using the central operating reserve to address the grant reduction – to address unexpected risks. The Board is mindful that continual pressure from three directions at once -- a reduced operating grant, a reduction of our reserves and restrictions on our capacity to raise other revenue -- is not sustainable and that the university requires stable funding and continues to work with the government to this end.

The Board approved the Sexual Assault Prevention Policy and approved renaming Arts court as Elders Court. RenewUS is a program that recognizes the growing need to address deferred maintenance of university infrastructure. The Board reviewed how to move the core campus renewal forward. The Board recently discussed the vision, mission and values process and provided their views to the visioning committee. The Board approved the ASPA and CUPE 3287 collective agreements, and approved the award of renewal of probation, promotion and tenure in accordance with the collective agreement with the USFA.

The Board approved Phase 1 of the relationship management system – this phase implements the student recruitment module and will give the university the ability to assist students to select programs to achieve their educational and career goals. On March 28th the Board hosted its annual reception at Louis’ Loft which provided an opportunity for Board members to interact with members of the university community.

9. University Council

9.1 Report on University Council

Roy Dobson, Council Vice-Chair, provided the report on University Council referring first to the written report in the meeting package. There were no questions.

9.2 Request for Confirmation of University Council Decisions

9.2.1 Addition of the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) as an Admissions Qualification to the Master of Arts (M.A.) in Economics

Prof. Dobson provided a brief description of the GRE as an admissions qualification for the Master of Arts in the Department of Economics. A senator asked why the GRE requirement was being introduced only for students who had not completed their university degrees in Canada and the US, and Prof. Dobson advised that he did not know the answer. The GSA president noted that these exams are very expensive and suggested that in the future the university should try to include in its assessment the economic value to get into the university.

BAXTER-JONES/NEUFELDT: That Senate confirm the addition of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) as an Admissions Qualification to the Master of Arts (M.A.) in Economics, effective for students who have not completed university degrees in Canada or the United States of America and who are entering the program in or after September 2017.

CARRIED

9.2.2 Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.) Program – Admissions changes

Prof. Dobson noted that the Pharm.D. program, if confirmed, will begin classes in September 2017 and graduate the first students in June 2021. It will replace the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy program.

A senator asked how it was justified that the tuition was almost double that of the undergraduate program. Prof. Dobson advised that the requirements are more extensive because some of the current sciences being provided in the first two years will become prerequisites allowing for more pharmacy specific content to be provided in the program, it will be more structured in how the practical training is provided, and additional faculty will be hired to provide the practical experience.

A senator asked if the College of Medicine can be linked with this program. Yvonne Shevchuk, Associate Dean, College of Pharmacy and Nutrition explained that inter-professional education is a big part of the Pharm. D. program and the college is working with the health sciences group to develop the program. In response to a question about how the increased requirement for inter-professional education will be provided, Prof.

Shevchuk advised that the college will build on the inter-professional learning modules that they have; and models of inter-disciplinary work were also being built through the Council of Health Science Deans.

A senator suggested the development of learning modules about social competencies around gender and sexual diversity and Aboriginal issues. Prof. Dobson explained that the college was actively developing the new curriculum and had a lot of interaction around developing social competencies for diversity of many types.

Doug Freeman, Dean of the College of Western Veterinary Medicine, advised that he strongly supported this motion and encouraged other senators to vote in favour because increasing inter-professional training to get health professions to work together is very important.

STUMBORG/SMITH: That Senate confirm the admission changes in the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition with the introduction of the Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.) program, effective September 2017.

CARRIED

10. Senate Committee Reports

Non-Senate members left the meeting and the Senate went into a confidential sitting.

10.1 **CONFIDENTIAL** Honorary Degrees Committee

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

Non-Senate members were welcomed back to the meeting.

10.2 Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor

The chancellor recused himself from the meeting due to the potential conflict of interest.

10.2.1 Report of the Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor

President Stoicheff, chair of the committee, provided the report. He advised that the committee has met twice. Once when Chancellor Favel had indicated that he would like to serve a second term and again when he decided that he could not serve a second term.

10.2.2 Recommendation to Form an *ad hoc* Bylaws Review Committee to Identify the Process when Considering Renewal of a Sitting Chancellor

President Stoicheff explained that the committee identified that the Senate Bylaws were lacking when it came to determining what to do when a sitting chancellor wished to sit a second term as they are unable to answer the following questions: Does the university still advertise for full nominations if a sitting chancellor chooses to sit a second term? If senators are asked to vote on a chancellor sitting a second term – what are the criteria to vote on? And what does the committee use as criteria to look at recommending a chancellor for a second term. Therefore the committee is recommending an ad hoc bylaws

review committee be formed to recommend to Senate amendments to the bylaws.

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.

CARRIED

The chancellor returned to the meeting.

10.3 Senate Executive Committee:

10.3.1 Report of the Senate Executive Committee

President Stoicheff reported on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, noting that the written report was in the materials.

10.3.2 Appointments to Nominations Committee

WELLS/FLATEN: That Senate approve the following senators to the Senate Nominations Committee for one-year terms beginning July 1, 2016 and ending June 30, 2017: Lori Isinger, Vera Pezer, Colleen Toye and Christine Wesolowski; and that Senate approve Lori Isinger as chair of the Senate Nominations Committee.

CARRIED

10.4 Nominations Committee Report

10.4.1 Committee Membership for 2016/17

Vera Pezer, acting chair of the Nominations Committee spoke to the report. She advised that since the meeting materials were distributed to Senate Davida Bentham has confirmed that she would be willing to serve as chair of the membership committee, so this appointment is being added to the motion.

ISINGER/MENZIES: That Senate approve the appointments to Senate committees and positions as indicated in the attached schedule for 2016/17, effective July 1, 2016 and with Davida Bentham as chair of membership committee.

CARRIED

10.5 Education Committee and Discussion Topics

10.5.1 Report of the Education Committee

Pat Flaten, member of the Education Committee spoke to the report as the chair was unable to attend. She noted the topics that would be discussed today will be the vision, mission and values statement, and thanked the committee for its work.

10.5.2 Visioning Committee

Liz Harrison and Brent Cotter, co-chairs of the Visioning Committee, emphasized that they were at the meeting today to listen to senators. The rest of the Visioning Committee was introduced: Lee Ahenakew, Karen Prisciak, Liz Duret, student Scott Adams, Jennifer Robertson were present, and also on the committee were Wendy Roy, Elder Harry Fontaine, and Tom Crosson.

The co-chairs shared that the goal of the project is to provide the U of S with a proposed new vision, mission and values document, building on the history of institutional dialogue and planning that has shaped the university's aspirations over the past 23 years. Members of the committee have met with: all of the colleges and schools, provincial government, USSU, GSA, president, Board, Council's planning and priorities committee, Aboriginal community, some alumnae, donors, and health regions. Further consultations are planned with Saskatoon city and Chamber of Commerce. Consultations have been very positive and people are very passionate about being involved with the U of S and looking to the future.

Regarding processes and timelines, the co-chairs advised the initial survey that was more exploratory was completed in February 2016, consultation meetings have been ongoing, the committee reviewed a variety of past strategic documents (this committee is not doing strategic planning, although strategy will be informed by this work), and another survey has come out and all senators are encouraged to respond. The goal is for the approval process to occur over the next months, with Senate being asked to approve a final document when meeting again in October. Close to 3000 people responded to the first survey which was intended to ask big questions; and the responses to those questions were shared with Senate.

Prof. Cotter noted that this was now the opportunity to hear the Senate's view on the values that the institution and its people should embrace. A mission statement was last formulated in 1993, and this is the first meaningful exercise to try to articulate the mission, vision and values for the university into the future.

The co-chairs illustrated word clouds which were formulated from the responses received to the big questions posed in the first survey. They illustrated a high degree of enthusiasm about campus, its beauty, meaningful nature of the people and province in which it is situated, importance of students. The larger words in the word clouds are what we heard more of, and are what distinguishes the U of S from other universities and PSE institutions. There is the aspect of the growing nature of Aboriginal. The co-chairs illustrated the mission key words and vision key words – showing the central messages received through the survey. The values were illustrated, and it was noted that the values

look at the human relationship within the university and how the university and people within it will respect one another.

10.5.3 Vision/Mission/Values Discussion Break-Out Session

Questions considered during the break-out session:

1. What makes or could make the U of S unique/distinct among Canadian universities?
2. Looking forward 10 years, what are your aspirations for the U of S?
3. What values should guide the attitudes and behaviours of the university and its people?
4. Are there any other thoughts/comments for the committee?

A senator asked what analytical process will be used to analyze the data received. Prof. Harrison answered that with the consultation, they are using thematic analysis related to the variety of inputs. This is the exploratory component and it is not a peer research endeavour – but rather a descriptive approach to evaluate what we are doing. The committee uses a software program to develop the thought clouds.

The Senate meeting recessed for a lunch break at 12:15 pm and reconvened at 1:11 pm.

10.5.4 Report to the Plenary on the Break-Out Session

Prof. Cotter stated that the engagement of Senate has produced some of the best engagement experienced in this process. He asked that the note-takers from each breakout group provide their comments to Lesley Leonhardt who will post them on the Senate page of the university secretary's website. *[Secretary's note: Answers from break-out groups have been posted on the Senate page at <http://www.usask.ca/secretariat/governing-bodies/senate/U%20of%20S%20Vision%20Consultation%20Roundtable%20Responses%20April%202016.pdf>*

Prof. Harrison invited senators to send the committee emails with any further ideas, as the committee was very happy to receive that input. She also invited senators to complete the second survey.

11. Presentations

11.1 Global Institute for Food Security (GIFS)

Maurice Moloney, Executive Director of GIFS, explained that GIFS was founded in 2012 through a philanthropic donation from Potash Corporation of \$35M, \$15 M from the Province of Saskatchewan and \$2M donated from Viterra. Between 2012 and when Dr. Moloney joined the centre only a small amount of that money had been distributed. Dr. Moloney advised that he assisted in putting together a clear strategic plan of how this would operate and a group of internationally renowned agricultural scientists to help determine how to operate. When Potash Corp. put in the money they did not predispose the money to any one activity but rather left it to the university's scientific community to figure out ways to position this to have relevance to global food security.

Dr. Moloney explained about GIFS' strategic plan. He noted that being a global institute positions GIFS to think globally about why food security is so important. Food security is already a significant problem for more than 800 million people who are on the borderline of starvation. The whole feeling of rebellion during the Arab Spring in 2011 spread across North Africa - manifested in many different ways. This was sparked by a sense of people who were disenfranchised, to do something about their situation. Already many people were arriving in Southern Europe by boat and this continues today. Fundamentally this was fueled by food insecurity. Once food insecurity turns into something more political, it is difficult to stand on the sidelines. There are many people still living a subsistence farming life and the distribution of wealth in their country is unacceptable. People will move towards where the food is – either a friendly migration or an unfriendly migration.

Canada is in a remarkable situation – being a breadbasket nation of the world. If Saskatchewan was a country we would be one of the top ten producers in the world. We are one of the top ten exporters of lentils overall, and in top eight of world producers. We are one crop disease from a major disaster in the world.

In food security terms, we have a responsibility because our food to population ratio is very favourable. We are going from a world population of 7 billion to 9.6 billion by 2050. Of that group there will be a burgeoning middle class that will have buying power and will determine grain prices; they already look to Canada for high quality product. So we have both a responsibility and an enormous opportunity for our farmers to adapt to this situation.

We have a significant question on our hands – how do we increase food production? There isn't a lot more arable land to expand into. We have to figure out how to get higher yields from the same amount of land, and when you add climate change - expect certain areas to become even more arid. Statistically, Western Canada may do better but we cannot rely on that.

We started farming probably 100,000 years ago, in the next 50 years we will have to produce as much food as has been produced to date to feed the population. Population growth will probably flatten out around 2050, so there is a narrow window of time and we need to act quickly. We will have to find some technologies that are fast and can solve these problems.

Regarding where GIFS fits, Dr. Moloney advised that the emerging middle class is still disenfranchised economically. There is a need for food technologies to make increased production cheap and accessible in Africa. There cannot be an industrial revolution until there is an agrarian revolution. The first thing we will see is people having enough grains and oil seeds to allow them to trade some, rather than just subsist. This then becomes an economic cycle, and allows people to become part of the economic cycle and have better lives and contribute to society.

GIFS can show a lot of leadership to other organizations around the world on how to leverage the science we are engaged in to help resolve some of the issues. We will have to produce more grain and the disenfranchised need to improve their own agriculture. GIFS will investigate technology to improve productivity and food nutritional quality. The same technology can be repurposed for a developing world.

We have done an exhaustive analysis of the areas where this is true – and decided that we will work on: seeds, soils and software. Seeds and hybrids – determining how you get hybrids in the hands of people who need them most and can benefit from the higher yields; soils are going to be a critical factor of how to meet this challenge and some kind of technological intervention is needed in Africa because soil quality is a concern; software and digital agriculture – parts of Africa have leapfrogged communications technology and jumped way ahead and will continue to adopt technologies and leapfrog in many respects. We want to build a database of image based systems regarding plant diseases. This will give people the ability to access high technological information and relatively cheaply.

We will have technologies that will have a dual use and provide an opportunity to channel through to the developing world. We want to encourage graduate students as to how to develop a mentality to take these technologies and try to repurpose for these two realities: to develop more grain and to advance economic systems.

In response to a call for questions, a senator noted that she had been in Uganda and other places and observed very healthy crops – partly due to their method of mixed agriculture. Crop disease comes out of industrialized food production with one crop being produced. The senator felt that when these countries are characterized as having a subsistence farming life, we are imposing Western values on them that do not measure economic activity that you do for yourself. This type of economic activity is characterized as having no value and those living that reality are said to be living in poverty. The senator suggested they are not living in poverty and that food production fuels population growth. The senator felt that educating women to control population growth would be beneficial. The senator also commented that in emphasizing oil seed production Dr. Moloney is actually speaking of canola that is GMS canola, which is patented and expensive. By promoting monoculture production there is a rise in crop diseases because GMO crops have a higher incidence of fusarium. Would GIFS look at addressing these underlying things?

Dr. Moloney noted that the senator's experience in Africa was extremely important – and she was saying that they should practice agriculture in a different way – and that is correct and important for the remediation of soil. You want the rotation of crops to be optimized for the food needed and for the soil. He provided one correction in that the onset of fusarium is in wheat – and there is no GMO wheat in the world.

A senator commented on safeguarding food security, and that in the past people were starved off of the land to get what we have now, and asked Dr. Moloney how he will make sure this will not happen again. He also noted that in the north the cost of living is very expensive and they have lost a lot of caribou, and he asked how this can be replaced or people can grow their own vegetables just to eat. Dr. Moloney indicated that as a small institute it is difficult to correct the wrongs that took place many years back; but there are certain technologies which could be used to alleviate the cost and provide more types of food in Northern Canada and GIFS should be able to do something about that. The best thing to do with excess carbon dioxide would be to feed it into a food growing system (such as an enclosed greenhouse), which would increase the growth rate by 30%. This would be done in places where there are industries that are generating carbon dioxide. This is currently being done at the British Sugar Factory where they collect all of the waste CO₂, pump it into greenhouses and produce one quarter of the tomatoes produced in the UK in a highly energy efficient manner. Dr. Moloney suggested that it could be

possible to put these types of systems together to address the northern parts of our country.

A senator congratulated the University for obtaining the funding for GIFS, but suggested that the institute is taking too narrow an approach by addressing food security only through technology. This is a complex issue and there is the need to determine food security through a wider approach which would include the social and ecological perspectives. The senator asked Dr. Moloney when GIFS will expand its circle of solutions. Dr. Moloney noted that this was a fair point, as in addition to agricultural research there is another element within the policy and economic space that would have massive leverage in providing a solution. At GIFS they have been trying to determine a way to fund some of this while not building a large organization to do it, and have been working with the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy and the College of Agriculture and Bioresources to figure out some of those answers.

A senator noted that Dr. Moloney spoke about history, politics and migration and asked whether funding was available to look at the human impact of food security. Dr. Moloney replied that there is and noted as an example the large grant of \$37 million that the University obtained recently from the Canada First Research Excellence Fund that included what he believed to be \$4.5M to fund social scientists to look at questions of public engagement about technology to determine the social license, as for example in the developing world many technologies can run into issues of local traditions to do things in a certain way.

A senator noted his agreement with Dr. Moloney that CO² is a good thing but too much contributes to climate change and asked whether Dr. Moloney was aware of the website, 350.org. Dr. Moloney replied that 350 parts per millions CO₂ was probably the level of CO₂ where we should be and noted that we need to bring the parties together to think these things through, as agriculture has part of the solution to the issues that are properly investigated.

12. Items for Information

12.1 Student Enrolment Report

Patti McDougall, Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, provided a report on annualized enrolment noting that the university sets targets for enrolment and then strives to meet those targets. Dr. McDougall presented a series of slides providing enrolment data broken down by undergraduate versus graduate student enrolment, direct-entry retention rates, graduation rates, increases in Aboriginal, domestic, and international students, and strategic enrolment management targets by college. She indicated that strategic enrolment management is about creating enrolment targets and evaluating those targets in terms of types of students, diversity within student populations, recruitment objectives, retention goals, and graduation numbers. A copy of the slides are attached as Appendix B.

A number of questions were received from senators. A senator asked if certain populations are targeted to have better access to residences on campus to assist in their success. Dr. McDougall explained that there were as spots are held in residence for some targeted groups – such as for athletes; to go alongside our Aboriginal achievement program; clusters of places; and for peer mentors.

A senator asked how the retention numbers compare to the University of Regina, to which Dr. McDougall replied that she was not sure. She noted that the retention rate varies across colleges at the U of S, so we could drill down and do some college comparisons to look at that question.

Chancellor Favel reported that Dr. McDougall received the USSU's Staff Spirit Award which illustrates her dedication to the students on campus. He noted that she is a quality staff member and exemplifies the staff who live their lives for this institution.

12.2 Senate Elections Update

The chancellor acknowledged and thanked the senators retiring from Senate. The university secretary provided information about the upcoming Senate elections that will run from May 2nd to June 16th. Elections will be held for senators in districts 8, 11, 12 and 14 and for four members-at-large. Senators were acclaimed in districts 2, 3, 4 and 9. There will be two ways for alumni to vote – online or by written ballot. The university secretary advised that efforts will be made to encourage participation in the voting process (such as election notices in the Saskatchewan weekly papers to reach alumni who do not use computers) and she asked Senate members to also encourage participation.

13. Other Business

13.1 Length of Meeting

A senator explained that she had submitted the request to Senate Executive regarding how to manage Senate meetings better. She suggested that her concerns may be able to be addressed, not by extending the length of the meetings, but by following the rules of order of the meeting and by making changes to the presentations coming to Senate. She noted that Kerr and King's *Rules of Procedure* are not readily available, and she would like to see people have better access and be informed of the rules of order. Regarding presentations coming to Senate, she thought it was important to empower the Senate education committee to put the presentations on the agenda and for senators to have a say about what is not on the agenda. She also noted that it is not uncommon at a meeting such as this to ask that 10 to 15 minutes be added to the meeting to allow people to bring questions and have discussions, in a way that reflects the diversity we have on Senate.

A senator suggested that presenters at Senate highlight only a few items and not reread Senate materials and asked that just the crucial sections of Kerr and King be circulated at each meeting.

A senator advised that during his last three years on Senate what he appreciated most was the opportunity to connect with people through discussions in small groups. This allows people to have input and a voice, and he heard a number of good ideas and had some productive discussions today.

A senator wondered if Senate could consider another forum for items that require more discussion that interest a few senators, as she did not believe the Senate meeting was the forum for this but she realized some senators would like to debate these issues. She also asked for a return to decorum and respectful behavior at the microphones, as a number of people were providing long preambles of personal views and opinions before asking their questions which was not respectful to the chancellor. Thirdly she stated that if there was

a purposeful will by some senators to create a negative image of the U of S she was very troubled by that as she did not think Senate meetings should be used to promote something negative.

A senator expressed her concern was that senators need to be reminded of the purpose of senate at the beginning of our tenure so we do not go off in different directions at Senate.

A senator explained that the night before every Senate meeting, she sits with a group of young, articulate, and intelligent senators pouring over the rules. She has never been refused to bring forward an item in business arising before – and that they had done their utmost to approach the request for Ms. Paul to speak at Senate with diplomacy.

The chancellor replied noting everyone was at Senate to support the university, not to use the university for our own platforms. It is important to hear what is happening at the university – such as what is being done for Indigenous people. He explained that there is much racism in the province and there is a wall of people he will not convince, and the more he advances his views in a contrary manner, the more they will not listen. So we must think carefully because the decisions made will affect this university. There has to be a healthy place in the middle where discussions can happen – that is the university.

The senator clarified that the item she brought as business arising had nothing to do with nuclear power – but rather it had to do with the labeling of anyone with her views at Senate as “fear mongers” – as she has heard the value in university discussions is to respect divergent views.

A senator noted that he has served on a number of boards and one of the procedures he sees as sacrosanct is that sitting senators should be able to call for the question, no matter what is being said.

13.2 Engagement of Senate Electorate

A senator spoke to the motion she submitted regarding elections in the districts. She noted that there had been difficulties in voting online, and it was important to realize that not everyone had access to high speed internet so elections cannot be run solely over the internet and notices of elections must be made in other ways. She also explained that candidates running for district positions did not have access to lists of district voters making it difficult to campaign and resulting in a low voter turnout. She concluded by stating that they want to make Senate elections more democratic.

MITTEN/THOMPSON: 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.

CARRIED

14. Question Period

In response to a question raised by a senator as to why Senate executive invited Neil Alexander, executive director of the Sylvia Fedoruk Canadian Centre for Nuclear Innovation to address Senate, Provost Ernie Barber explained that there were a lot of questions raised about the university's institutes so it was decided that leaders of the institutes should come to inform

Senate about the work of those institutes. That is why in addition to Neil Alexander, Rob Lamb, executive director of the Canadian Light Source and Maurice Moloney, executive director of GIFS, have presented at Senate on the work of their institutes.

A senator encouraged other senators to read two books that tell the story of nuclear: *Atomic Accomplice: How Canada Deals in Deadly Deceit* by Paul McKay; and *Canada's Deadliest Secret: Saskatchewan's Uranium and the Global Nuclear System* by Jim Harding retired professor from U of R.

A senator asked how can we be silent at the university about uranium mining, as there has been tragedy and loss at Aboriginal sites and this demonstrates colonization. Aboriginal people are told that they must take what the uranium mining companies offer as this is the only way they will survive – when will their experiences be heard and respected in Senate meetings? The chancellor responded that when Candyce Paul speaks he would also like to hear from chiefs in the northern communities as the chiefs are trying to partner with these organizations to get their people trained and to get them to university. President Stoicheff noted that if we are talking about Indigenous problems, a university is a wonderful place to have that kind of discussion or debate, but Senate is not the ideal place to have those debates as it has a tightly time-pressured agenda.

In response to the earlier comment that senators should support the university, a senator noted that when she questions the institution, she is a profound supporter of it, recognizing that there are changes necessary and information that needs to be tabled. We need to bring forward motions at Senate in order to function as an institution that is part of a democracy. Senate has a big role in this democratic institution to hold the administration to account - and to do so in a constructive way.

A senator agreed with Provost Barber that Senate wants to hear from the institutions, but asked that the Senate executive committee check the presentation materials in advance.

A senator noted that at the spring Senate meeting, senators are offered the opportunity to attend a reception, and encouraged senators who wanted an opportunity to discourse with other senators to attend the reception as it is the social events where we get the understanding from people.

A senator noted that Senate meets close to Place Riel which recognizes what happened to this province in 1885 and she would not want voices silenced now as they were then.

President Stoicheff led Senate in thanking Chancellor Favel for his service and for agreeing to continue to serve until a new chancellor was in place. The president shared how fortunate the university has been to have Chancellor Favel here during this period. When the university hosted the building reconciliation forum in November – the chancellor made it possible to get the key people here such as Justice Senator Murray Sinclair. The chancellor and president co-authored an op-ed that was printed in the Globe and Mail because of the chancellor; and Perry Bellegarde, Chief of the AFN and others have partnered with the university because the chancellor knows these people. The president expressed how very fortunate he has been to work with Chancellor Favel so closely. The Senate responded with a standing ovation.

15. Adjournment and Dates of Future Convocations and Senate Meetings

Spring Convocation: May 30 – June 2, 2016

Fall Senate: October 15, 2016
Fall Convocation: October 22, 2016
Spring Senate: April 22, 2017

In closing the chancellor shared that when he became chancellor it made a lot of people happy and he wished he could continue to help but he cannot. He encouraged everyone to keep working together, to try to get along and respect each other – and things will work out okay. He expressed that as Aboriginal people, we are not wrong to think that this is our land and that this country is ours – but what do you do – do we live in vile and anger – or try to live in something better. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission has taught what we can do. Our community is so strong and this province is so much stronger if we incorporate Aboriginal leaders. The chancellor stated that this was all that he has been trying to do -- he served his people and did his best. He was proud of the university and believes it has a really good president and administration who live for this place and do the best they can and as Senate we should assist the administration.

GULLICKSON/NEUFELDT: moved adjournment at 3:19 pm.

CARRIED