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

Lisa Kalynchuk, chair of Council called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Adoption of the agenda

DOBSON/WILSON: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

The chair made brief remarks, reporting that the recent breakfast meeting with Council committee chairs and members of the president's executive committee focused on strategies to manage the university's current budget situation. No firm decisions have been made about how to cope with the budgetary shortfall. A general principle discussed was that measures taken should be strategic and not reactive. The chair indicated that Council would receive a presentation about the university budget at the May Council meeting rather than the April meeting, as planned.

Closing her remarks, Professor Kalynchuk reminded members that the call for nominations for Council chair had been submitted to new Council members on April 3 and to existing members on April 17. She asked members to consider either themselves or their colleagues in this role.

3. Minutes of the meeting of March 23, 2017

The chair noted a correction to the minutes to correct the inaccurate attribution of a comment to Preston Smith, dean of Medicine under item 5.2. The correction was projected on the screen for members to view.

A Council member asked that the minutes also be amended to include reference to a comment made by Dean Smith that “padded” cv's are used by students to “buy” their way into Medicine.

FLYNN/SARJEANT-JENKINS: That the March 23, 2017 Council minutes be approved as circulated, with the corrections noted.

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

The chair asked for any notations of business arising. A member asked for assurance that there would be an evaluation and report back to Council of the admission change approved at the last Council meeting to set aside a number of seats in the MD program for Saskatchewan residents from lower socio-economics backgrounds. Professor Flynn, chair of the academic programs committee indicated he would follow-up with the college on the request. Dean Smith responded that the
change will be evaluated and the results shared. Dean Smith also indicated that although the college does not receive student cv's as part of its admissions criteria, that a diverse set of life experiences enhances performance on the MCAT exam, which is an admission requirement.

5. **Report of the President**

President Peter Stoicheff referred members to his written report. He congratulated the new USSU executive members and expressed gratitude for the experience of working with the former USSU and GSA leadership over the past year.

The President indicated that senior leadership continues to work through the institutional responses to the reduced university budget and commented on the federal budget, noting the strong investment in Indigenous student support, innovation clusters and research chairs. The Fundamental Science Review Report, informally known as the Naylor report, has been released. The report expresses an urgent need for investment in research across disciplines, international and national collaboration, and support for researchers across their careers. The university hosted a panel and made submissions to the report last summer. Universities now await the federal government response to the report.

The President reported on his recent trip to London, England, which included meetings with alumni and the Russell Group, which is a group of public research universities analogous to the U15. He noted there is a clear, heightened interest in building stronger relationships with post-secondary institutions outside Europe in anticipation of post-BREXIT repercussions as the United Kingdom leaves the European Union.

6. **Report of the Provost**

Interim Provost Michael Atkinson presented the Provost’s report to Council, indicating that senior administration is keeping close track of the budget conversations within colleges and schools so that members can advise on the changes proposed and provide some degree of coordination and communication among colleges. The university’s response to the budget reduction and the completion of its next integrated plan will coincide over the coming months.

Questions were invited of Provost Atkinson. Discussion focused on how the university will improve the student learning experience at the same time that units will experience a budget adjustment and on the receipt of the Indian Teacher Education Learning (ITEP) review report. The provost indicated he the report was not yet received and that he would comment on elements of the ITEP review report at a future Council meeting.

Provost Atkinson invited John Rigby, interim associate provost to present to Council on integrated planning. Professor Rigby provided a historical overview of the university’s integrated planning process and the first three integrated plans. The next integrated plan will use the new Vision, Mission and Value statement of the university as its foundation and will look visually quite different from previous plans, which were dense documents. The next plan will be a directional document that will provide broad themes and strategic objectives. Work plans will be developed to accompany the plan.

Professor Rigby also outlined the process of the development of the plan and related timeline, the membership of the advisory committee, and the consultations planned with the university.
community. Members were asked to consider the question of the two to three things critical for the university to achieve in the next five to eight years.

The plan will be based on the themes of diversity, sustainability, connectivity and creativity that emanate from the Vision, Mission and Value statement. Professor Rigby indicated that Indigenization will be reflected within the plan as part of the fabric of “who we are.”

A grass-roots approach was noted as preferable to the directional approach taken in developing previous plans. A request was made for an institutional discussion on strategic enrolment growth given the present financial pressure. Patti McDougall, vice-provost teaching and learning indicated that discussions with colleges about the barriers and opportunities for growth have already occurred.

7. Student Societies

7.1 Report from the USSU

Kehan Fu, president of the University of Saskatchewan Students’ Union (USSU) presented the USSU report, providing a recapitulation of the major highlights by portfolio of this year’s USSU team, executive, student council, and student volunteers.

President Fu offered thanks to members of senior leadership and of the support received from the President’s Office. Above all, he acknowledged the trust placed in students to be part of the decision-making process. Vice-provost McDougall acknowledged the extraordinary accomplishments of the USSU executive over the past year. In closing Mr. Fu left Council with the saying, “Students first, alumni forever” and encouraged the university to continue to enhance the student experience.

7.2 Report from the GSA

Ziad Ghaith, president of the Graduate Students’ Association presented the GSA report to Council. Mr. Ghaith reported that election results of the incoming executive would be known next week. The ThinkGRAD conference is presently underway and as hosts, the GSA is taking every possible opportunity to examine areas of concern faced by graduate students. The GSA continues to seek greater involvement in university governance, including on the Board of Governors. Mr. Ghaith thanked the USFA for their cooperation in highlighting the potential effect of the reduced budget on post-secondary education and thanked members of Council for being engaged with graduate student issues.

Adam Baxter-Jones, interim dean of the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies acknowledged the gradate student representation on college committees, the work of the GSA executive and the initiatives advanced by the executive throughout the year.

8. Governance Committee

Richard Gray, committee vice-chair presented the report on behalf of Louise Racine, chair.

8.1 Item for Information – Confidentiality of Council Committee Minutes
Professor Gray reported that the governance committee had engaged in several discussions this year on the topic of the confidentiality of Council committee minutes. In recognition of continuing concerns, the governance committee elected to amend the guidelines for Council committees by instituting an appeal process to the vice-chair of Council if a request for minutes is denied by the committee chair.

Several members commented favourably on the change but continued to express concerns about transparency and lack of evidence of the perceived “chilling” effect that would occur if the minutes were made more available.

9. Planning and Priorities Committee

Dirk de Boer, chair of the planning and priorities committee presented the committee reports to Council.

9.1 Request for Input – Policy for Medical Faculty

Professor de Boer introduced the request for input on the proposed Medical Faculty Policy, which sets out how the 1500 physicians in the province who contribute teaching services to the College of Medicine under an academic clinical funding plan (ACFP) are to be linked to the university community. The policy is based on a model that has been successful at other medical schools. The policy recognizes that while medical faculty are distinct from their faculty member colleagues, these individuals provide important academic contributions without which the college’s MD program would not exist. The policy confirms that medical faculty have similar academic rights, freedoms, and responsibilities to those of regular faculty and recognizes that medical faculty are engaged in valued academic work.

The term faculty member has a distinct meaning under the *University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995*, pertaining to a full-time employee of the university. The use of the term faculty was of concern to the committee and therefore clarification was sought through a legal opinion, which indicated that these individuals are not members of the General Academic Assembly (GAA). The policy is to be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval. Prior input from Council is sought, and Professor de Boer asked that comments be sent directly to him via email by April 30, 2017.

Preston Smith, dean of the College of Medicine, provided additional context to the item, speaking of the progress made by the college across multiple areas under *The Way Forward: Implementation Plan for the College of Medicine*. The college has renewed its leadership, redesigned its undergraduate and post-graduate curriculums, is in the process of restructuring the Biomedical Sciences departments and programming, has re-energized its research agenda and renewed its commitment to social accountability. Investments have been made in revising compensation procedures and enhancing the engagement of medical faculty. The college’s collegial standards for promotion and tenure have been rewritten to recognize the diversity of the faculty within the college to include the medical faculty, and to hold all faculty to high academic standards for promotion.

Dean Smith indicated the policy is necessary to address the “town/gown” divide between the college and community physicians, which has a long history. He indicated this has been the most crippling factor in engaging medical doctors in the work of the medical school to
the degree that describing these physicians as clinical faculty is considered pejorative by physicians. This is in part due to clinical faculty being previously held to a lower standard than other faculty in the college. The national norm is for all medical doctors to be involved in medical education instruction. The CanMED educational framework includes the role of scholar with the expectation that medical school graduates will do research and contribute to education as part of their career and be both practitioners and scholars.

The college’s accrediting bodies have provided the college with an additional year to engage medical faculty and put measures in place to hold medical faculty accountable for their academic work. Preston Smith indicated that there will be always a varying degree of engagement of medical faculty with the college. However, the expectation of the accrediting bodies is that the contributions of these physicians to the education of medical students will be recognized. Dean Smith expressed his belief that the policy before Council will satisfy the accreditors. Steps have already been taken to permit medical faculty to hold tri-agency grants and to be graduate faculty of the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. Provost Atkinson further assured Council of the rigour that the university review committee would apply in its review of the rewritten College of Medicine standards.

The chair invited comments and feedback. In response, there was an acknowledgement of the complexity of the challenges and solutions with recognition that being a medical-doctoral university is an intimate part of the university’s positioning within the U15 and among the Canadian collegium. Many members, however, expressed concern about the policy and the fact that other professional practitioners who contribute to academic programs across the university are not recognized as faculty. The implications of the policy relative to the recognition of these practitioners was noted, given that the contributions of these individuals are also critical to the sustainability of the university’s academic programs.

Although the college has always engaged with medical doctors to deliver its undergraduate curriculum, these individuals were previously known as clinical faculty. The removal of this descriptor was viewed as appropriating the term faculty member as understood by many to mean a fully committed member dedicated to the university’s mission. The addition of 1500 medical faculty to the faculty complement of the university was also seen as potentially bending the institution “out of shape.”

Objections were raised to the paragraph in the policy requiring university faculty and university administrative staff to facilitate collegial interactions with medical faculty as dictating behaviour and prescribing the way in which the academic community is to react. The timing of the consultation with the university community beyond the college just prior to the approval of the policy was perceived negatively as a lack of collegial consultation with those who are asked to be part of the process.

Requests were made to submit the policy document to Council for approval, to have Council receive the College of Medicine standards for promotion and tenure, and to have the college review its faculty council membership to ensure that quorum can be met with representation of medical faculty on the college’s faculty council.

Views in support of the policy were also expressed in favour of a model which will now bring the college in line with other medical schools across Canada and accreditation
standards. Improving the engagement of medical faculty was commented on favourably, with the structural change noted as enabling the college to complete its vision and assist the university in improving its ranking among the U15. More effective engagement of the medical faculty was supported as providing better medical care to people within the province, recognizing in particular the need associated with health concerns of the province’s Indigenous populations.

The chair closed discussion by inviting members to provide written feedback by writing to Professor de Boer.


Professor de Boer indicated that the establishment of the enrolment subcommittee was reported to Council in the spring of 2015, with a mandate to review the report, *Issues and Criteria when Consideration Viable Enrolments at the University of Saskatchewan* endorsed by Council in 2007 and report back to Council. The enrolment subcommittee discontinued its work in 2016 primarily due to the implementation of the Resource Centre Management (RCM) model and the university’s new transparent activity-based budget system (TABBS), which placed authority over enrolment more firmly within colleges and departments.

The planning and priorities committee reviewed the work of the enrolment subcommittee and agreed that the work, although important, was already being enacted within the colleges and schools. The report fulfills the commitment to provide a report to Council and provides closure to the subcommittee’s work. Although much of the viable enrolments report is dated, the planning and priorities committee affirms that the criteria to apply in assessing low-enrolment courses continues to be relevant. The criteria respects that these considerations belong at the department and college level.

The report was met with several comments from members that confirmed the relevance and nuanced perspectives reflected in the criteria and the 2007 viable enrolments report.

10. Other business

There was no other business.

11. Question period

The chair invited questions. There were none.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by motion (DOBSON/FLYNN) at 4:45 pm.