

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

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

1. Opening Remarks

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

2. Adoption of the Agenda

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

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

CARRIED

3. Minutes of the Meeting of April 23, 2016

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

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

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

CARRIED

4. Business from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Joint Nomination Committee for Chancellor

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

5.1 Vote on recommendation for Chancellor

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

Guests were invited back in.

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

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

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

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

6. President's Report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.1 Mission, Vision and Values statement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CARRIED

7. Report on Undergraduate Student Activities

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

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

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

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

8. Report on Graduate Student Activities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DEFEATED

9. Report on Board of Governors Activities

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

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

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

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

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

10. University Council

10.1. Request for Confirmation of University Council Decisions

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

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

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

CARRIED

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

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

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

CARRIED

11. Senate Committee Reports

11.1 Senate Executive Committee Report

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

11.2 Senate Nominations Committee Report

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

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

CARRIED

11.3 Senate Membership Committee Report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CARRIED

Recognition and Thanks to Chancellor Blaine Favel

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

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

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

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

12. Senate Education Topic – Student Mental Health

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13.1 Library Transformation Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14. Items for Information

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

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

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

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

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

14.2 Policy Oversight Committee Annual Report 2015/16

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

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

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

14.3 Senate Elections – Nominations Open

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

15. Other Business

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

16. Question Period

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

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

17. Adjournment

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

The Senate meeting was adjourned by motion.

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

Senate Attendance October 15, 2016

APPENDIX A

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