Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the March 19, 2020 Council meeting took place electronically.

Due to the meeting being held electronically, the attendance and quorum were determined by voting. Since our voting through the PAWS process is created and operated as such to maintain integrity and privacy of the voting process, we do not have access to the list of names of who attended.

On March 16, 2020, the Coordinating Committee determined that the University Council meeting needed to take place electronically due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The instructions to members for the Council meeting, and the agenda and materials were circulated on March 17, 2020. The following is a summary of the procedures that were used.

**Council’s March 2020 Electronic Meeting Procedures**

The meeting was “opened” electronically at 2:30pm on March 19, 2020 for questions regarding any of the reports or motions provided in the agenda materials. Questions and comments could be directed to Michelle Kjargaard during the regularly scheduled meeting time, i.e. from 2:30-4:30pm, at Michelle.Kjargaard@usask.ca.

A working group was behind the scenes taking questions and triaging for answers via WebEx and email during the Council meeting time. This group was comprised of the Council Chair, Jay Wilson; University Secretary and Chief Governance Officer, Chelsea Willness; Associate Secretary, Academic Governance, Jacque Thomarat; Student Appeals/Academic Programs Coordinator, Amanda Storey; and OUS Administrative Assistant, Michelle Kjargaard. Council chairs were also on standby to receive questions or solicit responses from proponents of requests for decisions or items for information.

The Q&A proceedings were compiled and posted on the Secretariat website on March 24, 2020, at 2:00pm and are available here: https://secretariat.usask.ca/documents/council/agenda/2019-2020/march2020/council-meeting-q-and-a-march-19,2020.pdf. A memo was sent to Council members and non-members with this link to the Secretariat website in order to share the Q&A records with the members of the governing body. Following this process, voting was opened.

Voting on decision items was open from March 21, 2020 at 10:00am to March 24, at 5:00pm via PAWS. Due to the Office of the University Secretary not having access to some student, and federated and affiliated college representatives’ NSID’s at the time that the electronic voting ballot was prepared, some ballots were sent by email to those Council members. Otherwise voting was on PAWS.

Following the close of the vote, a memo was sent to Council members and non-member participants with the link below at the Secretariat website to communicate the results of the vote: https://secretariat.usask.ca/documents/council/agenda/2019-2020/march2020/voting-results-on-decision-items-council-meeting-march-19-2020.pdf

Quorum was determined (42 members is 40% of 104) by the number of voters. 67 members voted. The meeting was “closed” by consensus at the close of voting at 5:00pm on March 24, 2020.
1. **Call to Order**

The meeting was “opened” electronically at 2:30pm for questions regarding any of the reports or motions provided in the agenda materials.

2. **Tributes**

There were no tributes for the March 2020 Council meeting.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda**

The agenda was circulated electronically on March 17, 2020. No edits were received by Michelle Kjargaard prior to 2:30pm, Thursday, March 19, 2020.

*The agenda was adopted by consensus.*

4. **Opening remarks**

The chair and university secretary shared messages regarding the March Council meeting procedures in advance as provided in the agenda and materials.

4.1 **Briefing Note – COVID-19 and Declaration Regarding Syllabi Changes**

Provided in the agenda and materials.

5. **Approval of Minutes of the meeting of February 20, 2020**

No edits were received by Michelle Kjargaard prior to 2:30pm Thursday, March 19.

*The minutes of February 20, 2020 were adopted by consensus.*

6. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

No business arising from the minutes was received via email to michelle.kjargaard@usask.ca before 8:30am Thursday, March 19, 2020.

7. **Report of the President**

A written report was provided in the agenda and materials. There were no questions received on this agenda item.
8. Report of the Provost

There was no report from the provost. There were no questions received for the provost.

9. Student Societies

9.1 Report from the USSU

A written report was provided in the agenda and materials. There were no questions received on this agenda item.

9.2 Report from the GSA

A written report was provided in the agenda and materials. There were no questions received on this agenda item.

10. Nominations Committee

10.1 Request for Decision: Nomination to the search committee for the provost and vice-president, academic

(SQUIRES/SOMERVILLE): It is recommended that Council approve the nomination of the following individuals to the Provost Search Committee effective immediately:

One (1) Council member appointed by Council; must hold a senior administrative position

i. Keith Willoughby, dean, Edwards School of Business

Four (4) GAA members appointed by Council

ii. Loleen Berdahl, professor and department head, Political Studies

iii. Jaswant Singh, professor, Dpt. of Veterinary Biomedical Sciences

iv. Donna Goodridge, professor, College of Medicine

v. Bonita Beatty, associate professor, Dpt. of Indigenous Studies

Nominations from the floor would have been accepted if they were sent between 2:30pm – 4:30pm Thursday, March 19, 2020 to michelle.kjargaard@usask.ca. No nominations from the floor were received.

There were no questions received on this agenda item.

Electronic ballot results:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED.
11. Academic Programs Committee

11.1 Request for Decision: Language Teacher Education Program (LTEP) for the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) Program

(DETMER/BROOK): It is recommended that Council approve the Language Teacher Education Program for the Bachelor of Education Program, effective May 2021.

A Council member submitted the following: “I support the concept of the proposed programme. The admission criteria are silent on the language ability of applicant. I note that in the document it is stated: “The Conseil des Écoles Fransaskoises administration affirmed the need for fluent and trained language speakers but highlighted the importance of including pedagogy and practice for teacher candidates who aspire to teach in programs where French is the first language.” The same need for fluency in Cree is noted. While students in the program have to take some French classes, I am unsure that this is adequate to ensure fluency.

How does the proposed programme meet the stated needs of the educational community for teachers who are both fluent and meet the needs for pedagogy and practice?”

Dr. Susan Detmer, chair of APC referred the question to Dr. Dawn Wallin in the College of Education. She responded that “The fluency will be assessed prior to the extended practica placement. There are numerous fluency “tests” for French, and Giselle has been examining all of these and is in consultation. We also have numerous partners in the school systems who have people in their divisions who are charged with ensuring proper fluency levels for Core vs Immersion programming, and this is what we have relied upon without any other pedagogical support prior. So this is the aim for French and all students will go through that process during the program, though not necessarily at the front end of the program, but at the time of student placements in Core or Immersion schools.

The fluency for Cree and potential ways to ensure fluency is being examined by Dr. Kevin Lewis in consultation with a number of groups/Language Keepers as this is a growing area. However, because part of the Cree in particular is language revitalization, at the moment, we are hoping to support Cree learners as language developers with growing that portion for that group of students.”

Electronic ballot results:

- Yes: 65
- No: 0
- Abstain: 2

CARRIED.

11.2 Request for Decision: Admissions Qualifications change - Doctor of Medicine (MD) program
(DETMER/BROOK): It is recommended that Council approve the proposed changes to the admissions qualifications for the Doctor of Medicine (MD) program, effective the 2021-22 admissions cycle.

There were no questions or comments related to this agenda item.

Electronic ballot results:
- Yes: 62
- No: 2
- Abstain: 3

CARRIED.

11.3 Request for Decision: Admissions Qualifications change – Master of Arts (M.A.) in Applied Social Psychology

(DETMER/BROOK): It is recommended that Council approve the proposed changes to the admissions qualifications for the Master of Arts (M.A.) in Applied Social Psychology, effective the 2021-22 admissions cycle.

A council member submitted the following. “I have concerns about Agenda item 11.3. The rationale for removing the GRE requirement does not appear to be sound, and the evidence provided is weak.

1. We should consider whether comparable programs in Canada and the United States ask for GRE scores for admission in the program. That information has not been provided.

A quick search of other Canadian universities (Toronto, Calgary, Alberta, Regina, Dalhousie) appears to show that requiring the GRE is the norm. If this program is the only one in the department that requires it, the question should be "Why don't others?" rather than "Why should this one?"

2. Asking for GRE scores does not require the department to use them rigidly or blindly. If the department has information suggesting that there are limitations to predictive ability of GRE scores, they should use that information to use and interpret them accordingly.

Most metrics have limitations, which is exactly why we use multiple metrics. There is nothing stopping the department from considering the limitations when evaluating international applicants. That's what every department does.

3. The most important use of GREs is to help compare applicants from institutions across the world using the same test. It is most useful in evaluating international applicants because we know least the least about international institutions. Despite GRE's limitations, this is the precise reason why the institutions which use them do so. The department's argument that GPAs are a better indicator is simply not correct. GPAs are relative to the cohort of students, which varies widely depending on the competitiveness of the institution.
Not to mention that unless an international student is applying only to the U of S, they would likely be taking the GRE for other institutions regardless.

4. The evidence provided by the department appears to be selective and one-sided. There has always been literature criticizing the GRE, and still the vast majority of competitive institutions expect submission of GRE scores, especially for international students. The reason for this is that the arguments on the other side are stronger. The key is to use the GRE appropriately in combination with other indicators, not to stop using it.”

Amanda Storey, secretary to APC first responded to the questions.

“I am unable to answer your question about why other universities continue to require a GRE for this program while USask is seeking to move away from it. I can pass that aspect of the question on to the proponents. That said, I will note that increasingly over the last 3-5 years APC and Council have heard concerns from its members about requiring tests like the GRE for international applicants, citing the very things that the proponents did in this proposal – the test’s low predictive value for student success and that international students from developing countries are disadvantaged by the requirement.”

The Council member reiterated that “My question to the APC is: did they ask or investigate into whether the GRE is required by comparator programs across Canada? On what precise basis do they believe that the rationale offered by the department is compelling?”

Amanda Storey, responded as follows to the second part of the question: “The proposal document outlined that other graduate programs in the Department of Psychology do not require a GRE, and further, that GRE scores have low predictive value for student success. The removal of the GRE as a requirement for admission will allow international students a better opportunity for admission into the program and ensures consistency across graduate programs in that department.”

The question was forwarded to Dr. Martha Smith, acting associate dean in CGPS.

Dr. Smith responded that “As I recall, members of the CGPS Graduate Programs Committee and the Executive Committee were persuaded by the rationale (low predictive validity, impact on international students, and past experience) that was provided by the unit. Although comparator information was not included in the rationale, I note that there are a couple of other Canadian institutions, such as McMaster University and Carleton University, that do not appear to require GRE scores for admission into their MA programs in Psychology.”

Electronic ballot results:
- Yes: 61
- No: 1
- Abstain: 5

CARRIED.
11.4 Report for Information: Degree-level certificate in Medical Language

There were no questions or comments related to this agenda item.

11.5 Report for Information: Academic Calendar 2020-21

There were no questions or comments related to this agenda item.

12. Planning and Priorities Committee

12.1 Notice of motion: Jane and Ron Graham School for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

*It is recommended that Council approve the establishment of a Type-A centre for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the College of Education called the Jane and Ron Graham School for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, effective immediately.*

There were no questions or comments related to this agenda item.

13. Question period

There were questions about parking arrangements on campus the during COVID-19 pandemic, the process by with the coordinating committee undertook to approve changes to syllabi, and UnivRS.

First, a Council member asked the following. “I am not sure who would be best to answer this question, but it is urgent. I have post docs and students who need to come to campus at least for now for research. Many of them do not have a parking permit, and so are left with having to use public transportation because they can’t afford parking fees for daily paid parking on campus.

Given that undergrad students and many other students are not coming to campus and that many staff are working from home, can we please provide better parking options to those who do need to come to campus?

If not, making parking free and unrestricted in all lots and meters, then perhaps opening at least the student lots to anyone who needs to use them?

Thank you. I know this question is coming a bit early but it is vitally important to keeping our people safe and reducing exposure.” The Council member further inquired as to parking closer for Engineering, WCVM, VIDO and Agriculture, and the full campus community.

The chair responded that the lots by the field house and S lot by the College of Education are open 24 hours for students.

The update page with the specific parking information was shared: https://updates.usask.ca/info/staff.php#iconclockoTimeAwayfromWork

The question was passed along by the chair to university leadership to consider, as requested.
A response was provided by Quitin Zook, Director, Consumer Services. He indicated by email that “Many considerations were considered in making the parking lots available for this need initially which included location and not encouraging students and staff to come even more to campus by creating free places to park. We considered every parking lot when doing this initially. This was balanced with understanding the social distancing recommendations and how that is more difficult while using public transportation and how to make accommodations for this.

As things continue to change we are constantly considering adjustments to the process and how we continue to respond.

With the change to increased direction for staff to work from home we have continued to make similar adjustments.”

Mr. Zook further replied that “Effective immediately Lot Y will be included in a similar manner as Lot S, 15 and 20. This is temporary as it is in the other lots. I will work with communications to update this messaging.

This should provide reasonable accommodation for those staff and students who are required to come to campus but do not feel comfortable taking public transportation due to COVID-19.”

Second, a Council member inquired as to an email faculty received on March 15 stating: “Can I change my syllabus? To support you in the move to remote instruction and examinations, University Council has granted authority to instructors to alter syllabi for their classes for the duration of the COVID-19 Pandemic. This includes looking at alternative forms of delivery and examination.”

The Council member asked “I am not aware that there was a communication to UC [University Council] members about that decision prior to this announcement. Is that correct?

I believe that there is an electronic decision-making process approved for use by University Council when they are unable to meet in person. Is that correct? If so what was the reason that process not utilized?”

The chair responded to the question. He stated that the process was followed whereby governance may delegate a decision on behalf of council and referred to the briefing note “COVID-19 and Declaration Regarding Syllabi Changes” (available here: https://secretariat.usask.ca/documents/2020-03-17-declaration-re-syllabi-changes.pdf)

Following the response of the chair, the Council member further inquired as to the communication process. “As a UC member it was a surprise to hear the decision from Gwenna Moss. An SOP regarding communication may be needed. A recommendation is to have CC [coordinating committee] communicate this type of emergency decision to faculty rather than Gwenna Moss.

My question is regarding the alternative process where electronic decisions are made by UC members. This is apparently being used to vote on decision items for the March meeting.

Was this considered by Governance or CC? Was there a rationale for not using it?”

The chair responded that “A message was sent out from Michelle Kjargaard to all Council members on March 15 at 1:30 pm before the information was circulated by Gwenna Moss. As you can appreciate...
things were moving very rapidly and we felt the providing faculty the okay to make changes needed to be done in a timely fashion. In cases where the temporal pressures are less such as the March Council meeting we were able to use electronic means to vote. A decision was made in the best interests of council and yes we considered other options.”

Another Council member raised a question regarding UnivRS. “My question is directed to the Vice Provost, Faculty Relations (for follow-up the next council meeting; I’m not expecting an answer today).

The adoption of the UnivRS curriculum vitae system has been delayed for several years, but is still on track for adoption in the fall of 2020. However, the system remains cumbersome and inefficient to use. This system requires faculty and staff to spend excessive time on trivialities of the data management system, rather than the higher-level teaching and scholarship work. The misallocation of effort is now more significant, as we turn our attention to addressing the global pandemic and a move to emergency modes of teaching.

I ask the Vice Provost Faculty Relations to cancel the adoption of the UnivRS curriculum vitae system for this fall, and undertake a review this CV project, to ensure that the system’s implementation is matched to the purpose it serves.”

The question was passed along to the Vice-Provost, Faculty Relations, Dr. Ken Wilson. He responded that an answer would be provided at the next Council meeting in April 2020.

14. Adjournment by consensus as of close of voting at 5:00pm on Tuesday, March 24, 2020.

Table 1. Action items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Action item</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p.8 s.13</td>
<td>Respond to UnivRS curriculum vitae system question</td>
<td>Dr. Ken Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments

1. Appendix A – Attendance from the meeting of March 19, 2020