AGENDA
2:30 p.m. Thursday, May 22, 2014
Neatby-Timlin Theatre (Room 241) Arts Building

*In 1995, the **University of Saskatchewan Act** established a representative Council for the University of Saskatchewan, conferring on Council responsibility and authority "for overseeing and directing the university's academic affairs." The 2013-14 academic year marks the 19th year of the representative Council.*

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Opening remarks

3. Minutes of the meeting of April 17, 2014

4. Business from the minutes

5. Report of the President

6. Report of the Provost

7. Student societies

   7.1 Report from the USSU (oral report)

   7.2 Report from the GSA (oral report)

8. Research, scholarly and artistic work committee

   8.1 Report for information: Undergraduate research (brought forward from April meeting)

9. Nominations Committee

   9.1 Request for decision: Nominations to committees for 2014-15

   That Council approve the nominations to University Council committees, Collective Agreement committees, and other committees for 2014-15, as outlined in the attached list.

10. Governance committee

    10.1 Notice of motion: Council bylaws amendments

    That Council approve the following amendments to Council Bylaws:

    1. *Addition of the following statement as Part One, III, 5 (k) "Unless the Council decides otherwise, the secretary of Council meetings shall be the University Secretary, or a member of the University Secretary's office as designated by the University Secretary."*

2. Deletion of the following two sentences from Part Three, I, 2 – "Recipients of degrees other than honorary degrees shall be presented for admission by the dean of the faculty, or a designate, to which the degree belongs. Each recipient of an honorary degree shall be presented for admission by the President or by a person designated for that purpose by the President."

3. Housekeeping changes to correct cross-referencing in Part One, III, 5 (f) and (g), as shown on the attached pages 5 and 6 of Council Bylaws.

10.2 Request for input: Amendment to *Procedures for Student Appeals in Academic Matters*

10.3 Request for decision: Nominations to the nominations committee

That Council approve the nominations to the Nominations Committee effective July 1, 2014 as attached, and Ed Krol as Chair of the Nominations Committee for a one year term effective July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.

11. Planning and priorities committee

11.1 Report for information: TransformUS Action Plan

12. Academic programs committee

12.1 Request for decision: Termination of the General Honours degree

That Council approve the termination of the General Honours degree, effective September 2014.

13. Other business

14. Question period

15. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Minutes of University Council
2:30 p.m., Thursday, April 17, 2014
Neatby-Timlin Theatre

Attendance: J. Kalra (Chair). See appendix A for listing of members in attendance.

A tribute to Dr. Chaturbhuj Sisadia from the Western College of Veterinary Medicine was given by Dr. Barry Blakley, the department head of Veterinary Biomedical Sciences in the Western College of Veterinary Medicine.

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:43 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Adoption of the agenda

DOBSON/KALYNCHUK: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

The chair welcomed members and visitors and noted the items coming before Council. At the chair's invitation the university secretary provided the election results for Council's faculty representatives being: Michael Nickerson for the College of Agriculture and Bioresources; Bill Roesler for the College of Medicine; and James Montgomery for the Western College of Veterinary Medicine; all for three-year terms commencing July 1, 2014 until June 30, 2017.

3. Minutes of the meeting of March 20, 2014

Two corrections were noted for the minutes, the first to note that Dr. Richard Farrell is not a department head; the second to add the word "socioeconomic" before the word demographics in the second paragraph of the report from the USSU.

MICHELMANN/DOBSON: That the Council minutes of March 20, 2014 be approved as circulated with the amendments noted.

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the President

President Ilene Busch-Vishniac commented on a number of events that have occurred since the last Council meeting including: the USSU has held its election re-electing Max FineDay as USSU president; Izabela Vlahu was elected as in-coming GSA president; and the USSU held their annual awards ceremony. The president also noted that she had attended the send-off for third year nutrition students, met with the Student Medical Society of Saskatchewan, and hosted a dinner for the Aboriginal Student Leadership group. The president commended the incredible year for Huskie Athletics noting that 11 teams made the national playoffs with six teams finishing in the top six in Canada.

The president provided comments on the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) meeting and the discussion on faith-based institutions and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom. The issue is not whether or not institutions should be afforded religious freedom, but that in describing and constituting themselves some institutions have taken issue with those in the lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender (LGBT) community. She noted that at a meeting of the executive heads of the AUCC a number of options were proposed. Although as yet there is no consensus, there is an awareness of the situation and a desire by the AUCC to have a clear stand on the issue. The president noted that there will be more information provided at a later date when a motion comes forward.

The president informed Council that she had been invited to join the Science, Technology and Innovation Council of Canada (STIC) which meets four times a year in Ottawa with the ministers of Science and Technology and of Industry. The Tri-council agencies report through STIC and it is an extremely important council and the president noted how pleased she was to have been invited for a three-year term being one of two university presidents on the council.

During the question session with the president, a Council member noted that the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) has been clear that if Trinity Western in establishing a law school requires a faith test that it will not be recognized as a university by the CAUT.

The chair congratulated the president on her appointment to STIC.

6. Report of the Provost

Dr. Brett Fairbairn, provost and vice-president academic, referred to his written report and highlighted three items including a report on expenditures made from the Academic Priorities Fund since its inception, which has been provided in response to a previous question at Council. The action plan that PCIP will release by May in response to the task force reports, will include a set of project briefs for each action proposed in the action plan document, and a set of responses to the taskforce recommendations to indicate which ones are covered by projects proposed, which ones the university should not take action on and why, and which ones will be left with unit leaders for consideration of further actions. The provost advised that the action plan will include some projects that are already underway such as the graduate education review of the College of Graduate Studies and Research. Thirdly, the provost noted that his report includes the provost teaching award winners and he congratulated them on their accomplishments. The provost then called for questions.

A Council member, noting that the report refers to principles and criteria factored into the action plan, including the new vision document, asked Dr. Fairbairn to provide more information on how the vision document will factor into the recommendations that will come forward through the TransformUS process. The provost advised that as PCIP has been developing the proposals and identifying projects to recommend and launch, they have been mindful of the discussion of the vision document and have been considering what the emerging content of the vision document signifies.

A Council member asked the provost what he meant by vertical silos in his report. The provost advised that the concept of silos signifies when parts of the organization are inwardly focused and have difficulty communicating with other parts of the organization.

7. Report of the Vice-president Research

Dr. Karen Chad, vice-president research, provided her report to Council on initiatives happening across the campus and specifically provided updates on the Research Mentorship Program and the One Health Initiative, one of the university's signature areas.

Regarding the Research Mentorship Program, Dr. Chad reported on a number of consultation groups that looked at the factors that helped contribute to an individual faculty member's success. The number one factor identified was the need for mentorship. Thereafter a university-wide research mentorship program was established as a joint effort of the office of the vice-president research and the provost's office. The program matches a personalized research mentorship team to new faculty members for a period up to five years. Dr. Chad noted that within the U15 there are 12 universities with teaching mentorship programs; however, only two of these are institutional programs, and none are research-focused.

Dr. Chad outlined that the goals of the Research Mentorship Program are to improve research success for new faculty, enhance the teacher-scholar model across campus and advance our research-intensive culture. She provided further detail on the participation rate of new faculty members in the program and the value of the program, as reported in a survey of new faculty participants and by mentors, in terms of their ability to contribute towards the success of new faculty enrolled in the program. Although the program is still in its early stages, the long-term goal is to have a 100% participation rate of new faculty members.

Regarding the One Health Initiative, Dr. Chad advised that the university is looking at solutions for issues at the intersection of human, animal and environmental health. She advised that more than 40 faculty members participate in the One Health initiative, as well as industry and government partners. A strategic plan submitted to the Council of Health Science Deans and PCIP identified the following four areas of research strength: food safety, water and health, infectious diseases shared by animals and humans, and one health community needs and services. Dr. Chad listed the faculty members leading each of the four areas. Dr. Chad also noted the university's success in being awarded a Canada Excellence Research Chair in Integrated Infectious Disease Mitigation. In concluding her remarks, Dr. Chad noted the undergraduate one health program, one health leadership experience and how the initiative is encouraging widespread collaboration across disciplines.

Dr. Chad received a number of questions. A Council member noted that he had heard that at the end of the Mitacs executive in residence announcement earlier in the month, a First Nations woman made critical remarks and was ignored by those present. Dr. Chad agreed that his description was fairly accurate and indicated it was unfortunate that individuals often do not know how to deal or respond to comments such as these. She acknowledged the importance of the issue raised, which relates to one of the thematic areas of the International Minerals Innovation Institute (IMII) being social consciousness, public policy, duty to consult and duty for engagement. Dr. Chad noted that she would bring forward the incident and lack of response, to the IMII as she sits on the board.

A Council member noted that there were four sub-groups under the One Health Initiative however none of them applies to the arts side of the College of Arts and Science and recommended that the arts be reflected within the initiative. Dr. Chad agreed that each of the thematic areas needs to embrace all of the disciplines and advised that the calls to participate go to the whole academy but that further facilitation may be needed to reach all faculty.

Other questions related to: the challenges and opportunities of open-source publishing –Dr. Chad advised that she would report further on the move towards open source publishing after speaking

with Dean Williamson, University Library; and progressing the Research Mentorship Program through non-participating colleges –Dr. Chad advised that Dr. Jim Thornhill (with support from Dr. Jim Germida) will be meeting with both participating and non-participating colleges and seeking advice from other universities with successful programs.

8. Student Societies

8.1 Report from the USSU

Jenna Moellenbeck, vice-president, operations and finance, of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union, delivered the report. She recalled the key initiatives of the USSU over the year, including the establishment of a fall reading week in support of student mental health, and the adoption and implementation of an open textbook policy at the university to alleviate student financial stress related to the cost of textbooks, which the provincial government has recently signed onto. The USSU will seek faculty support to implement the policy in their classes.

Regarding TransformUS, Ms. Moellenbeck advised that during the consultation and feedback period the USSU held its own consultation with different student groups and compiled responses into a report that was provided to PCIP. The hope and expectation is for university leaders to continue dialogues with student university leaders after the action plan has been released. Ms. Moellenbeck also reported on a number of other initiatives that the USSU brought forward over the year and named the new members of the USSU executive that had been elected for the 2014-15 year including: Max FineDay returning as president, Elias Nelson as vice-president operations and finance, Desiree Steele, vice-president academic affairs and Jack Saddleback , vice-president student affairs.

The chair asked Ms. Moellenbeck to pass on Council's appreciation for the work of the USSU to the entire USSU leadership.

8.2 Report from the GSA

Ehimai Ohiozebau, president of the Graduate Students' Association, presented a report on the work that has been accomplished by the GSA over the past three years, including access to the GSA commons, active participation by GSA members in governance, the new GSA website and increased graduate student scholarships. He thanked both the president for her support as an advocate for graduate students, and various academic units involved in the implementation of the devolved scholarship program.

Mr. Ohiozebau advised that the GSA has been working with the USSU in many areas such as the tuition waiver program support and open textbook policy; and the USSU has worked with the GSA on the provincial government's student retention program. Mr. Ohiozebau noted that the GSA provided increased advocacy since last year for students in the area of racial discrimination, and he advised that this needs to be addressed calmly and seriously, especially for international students. He advised that his hope is that the GSA will receive support to help students in this area. Regarding the GSA conference and gala, he advised that both were very well attended and he thanked all those who were in attendance.

In closing, Mr. Ohiozebau thanked the University Council for its support, and, in particular, thanked his supervisor and member of Council, Prof. Paul Jones for his kindness and support during his term as GSA president

The chair congratulated Mr. Ohiozebau for his leadership and work done for the GSA and provided congratulations and thanks to all of the GSA executive, noting that Council will continue to work effectively with the new executive.

Adam Baxter-Jones, acting dean of the College of Graduate Studies and Research, also provided his thanks to the work Mr. Ohiozebau has done noting that he has been outstanding in his leadership with the UPASS, scholarships and graduate retention programs. He also thanked Prof. Jones for his support of Mr. Ohiozebau.

9. Planning and Priorities Committee

Dr. Fran Walley, chair of the committee, presented this item to Council.

9.1 Request for Decision: Vision 2025: From Spirit to Action

Dr. Walley advised that the planning and priorities committee is recommending that Council approve the document as the new institutional vision document containing the new vision and mission statement for the university. The document is intended to become an institutional statement of the university's broadest goals and objectives and lay the foundation for the university's future integrated plans and foundational documents. Dr. Walley noted that she has heard it described as the foundational document of all foundational documents. The vision document does not supplant the current university's integrated plan, but rather provides guidance and direction for future university plans. The document speaks to the university's collective mission, vision and values and guiding principles and, as such, it is appropriate that Council be asked to approve the Vision 2025 document to voice its support of this collective vision and direction of the university.

Dr. Walley noted that an earlier version of the document came to Council in October at which time the committee reported on its discussion with the president. The committee expressed support for various elements but also suggested revisions. Input from the committee and subsequently from Council, Senate and the Board of Governors helped to further shape the document as did extensive feedback that was sought through town halls, public meetings and meeting with student organizations, alumni and administrative units, and government representatives. A number of colleges and departments also invited the president to present the draft document to their faculty, students and staff. Dr. Walley noted the significant changes made to the document since October.

Dr. Walley noted that at the most recent committee discussion of the document it was clear that there are many ways of articulating the vision. In recommending approval the committee signifies that despite having differences in opinion regarding the wording in the document, when taken on balance and as a whole the majority of the committee agreed to the document. Dr. Walley advised that it is from this perspective that the committee submits the document to Council for approval.

The president was invited to speak to the motion. She commented on why the university needs a vision document advising that it allows us to articulate where we as an institution are headed, describes our values and what makes us unique among our peers, provides a framework as a touchstone as other units are developing plans, and allows us to develop and refresh our foundational documents.

The president advised that she found the process of developing this document delightful and exciting. She tried to make sure it was open and transparent and sought input from as many

people as she could. The president advised that she also went to the USSU, GSA, Indigenous Student Council, alumni events and at least three committees of Council (planning and priorities, teaching, learning and academic resources, and research, scholarly and artistic work). Many comments were received, which frequently reflected dissenting views, and therefore not all comments could be incorporated.

Importantly, the president advised that between October and the present, the document has become the university's vision document, rather than the president's vision document. This does not mean everyone will agree with every word in the document, but rather that everyone feels they have had a chance to be a part of the process and is in agreement with the stance of the document. The document has become bolder and briefer. The Aboriginal engagement section was completely re-written after extensive consultation with students, faculty and staff on campus. The president concluded her remarks, by expressing that she has thoroughly enjoyed the process of shaping the vision document for the institution and very much appreciated the comments and feedback received.

A Council member asked what the relationship was between the vision statement and the University of Saskatchewan's mission statement. The president advised that a mission statement is "what we are meant to do as an institution" and a vision is "what do we want to achieve down the road in 10 to 15 years". The Council member asked whether the University of Saskatchewan mission statement that was approved in 1993 would continue to stand. The president clarified that if the Vision 2025 document is approved by Council, Senate and the Board of Governors, then the mission statement included in this document would replace the 1993 mission statement.

A Council member noted that it is an aspirational document with substantial operational implications, and recommended tabling the motion of approval of the document until after the release of the TransformUS Action Plan to see how PCIP interpreted the document in relation to the Action Plan. The university secretary advised that a motion to postpone temporarily is not debatable or amendable and requires two-thirds majority of votes cast for approval.

> FINDLAY/BROOKS: It is recommended that the document Vision 2025: From Spirit to Action be temporarily postponed for consideration until the next Council meeting.

DEFEATED

A Council member asked why this document was not called a mission statement so the community could compare both this document and the 1993 mission statement and come to a conclusion. The president advised that the mission statement has been in the document from the beginning, although its wording has changed slightly. She stated that this has been called a vision statement because a vision is what we are trying to achieve so it is a more appropriate name for the whole document.

A Council member asked how much weight the president envisioned the document having in its entirety. The president advised that Dr. Walley's description of the vision document being the foundational document of all foundational documents is the correct way to think about the document. The document is a statement of the university's aspirations, the values it holds dear, and its mission and vision.

A Council member registered two concerns with the document in its current form the first being on page six in the fourth bullet that states: "We will ensure our employees reflect the values of the university". He advised that this statement has a coercive element in it and it

should be revisited so it does not contain coerced collegiality. Secondly under the programs and planning section in the second bullet where it states, "We will honor a culture of planning, implementing plans and evidence-based decision-making", he recommended that "culture" be replaced with "cult" which would align more with academic and health "leanness".

A Council member noted that she has been very interested in the process and appreciative of some changes such as inclusion of "scholarly and artistic work" and also language from the Learning Charter and referring to "social responsibility, diversity and equality". She asked for the benefits of having the document approved today, rather than having the document discussed today and inviting colleagues to discuss it within their colleges, with a later approval date. Dr. Walley replied that there were pragmatic reasons for bringing the document to Council today being the desire to have it approved by Council, Senate and the Board of Governors before the end of the academic year. Also, there has been much consultation over the past months regarding the document.

A Council member noted that there have been visionary and mission statements from Walter Murray and founders of the university and again in 1993 that the university belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. A Council member also noted article 4.1 in the University of Saskatchewan Act and noted he finds that the present document, which he believes had its origins in the Dickeson algorithm of program prioritization processes, adds nothing that is not already embodied in the current mission statement. He stated that there is no necessity to approve a document that is not a creation of Council, however if Council should approve the document then Council will be held accountable for what is written and also the subsequent interpretations that will be made of it. His belief is that the 1993 mission statement is much more than the present document, and therefore indicated he could not support the new vision document.

A non-Council member spoke against the document, citing complaints with the institutes highlighted in the document, and that the values articulated in the document do not translate into the university's approach to workforce planning.
A Council member asked to what extent is the document amendable by Council to which the president responded that people who wish to can propose amendments to the motion.

A Council member recognized that much work has gone into the document and many people have been consulted and he commended the president on her inclusiveness. Nonetheless he provided several suggestions to improve the document, related to greater focus and integration of the vision statement with the statement on Aboriginal means and development in the document.

In response to a concern raised by a Council member regarding the timing of the development of the Vision 2025 document and the TransformUS process, the president clarified that a draft of the vision document was available at the time the task force reports and recommendations were being developed. The purpose of the documents also differs, as the vision document is intended to have a lifespan of 10 to 15 years; whereas TransformUS is meant to result in more immediate actions.

The provost added that PCIP considered the document as one of many documents, principles and criteria that it is referencing. The document does not come from the Dickeson model and has a different focus and purpose as outlined. This document is well-suited to being the longer term vision. There will be strategic documents for shorter terms as well as four-year planning documents to focus on four-year periods, all of which will be shaped and informed by this Vision document.

Dr. Walley informed Council of an amendment to the document suggested by the president to delete "We will ensure our employees reflect the values of the university, and it is our responsibility to make certain that" in the fourth bullet under "People" on page six and replace it with the remainder of the sentence, "We will embed sufficient professional development in our operations so that our personnel can grow their skills and expand their knowledge."

A Council member spoke in favour of the original motion noting that he views the document as one that he would like to live into and become and he was inspired by it. He noted that he sees it moving the university forward in the necessary direction. Recognizing that as a tri-cameral organization approval will also be sought of Senate and the Board of Governors; he recommended that Council approve the document, understanding that the president may seek modifications in the future.

A Council member noted that he believed the language was problematic and if the president was willing to make the modification suggested, that would encourage him to support the document.

A Council member suggested an additional modification to delete the sixth bullet in the Resources, Focus and Partnership section, which reads, "we will craft mechanisms to help us select which opportunities we will respond to in a timely fashion," due to the administrative tone conveyed by the sentence.

A Council member noted her regret that the following two clauses from the 1993 mission statement will be missing, "today, the university continues to provide liberal, artistic and professional education, enriching the lives of the people of the province," and, "to offer a rich array of challenging academic programs."

A brief recess was taken to confirm the amendment proposed by the president in the section on "People."

The chair called for the vote.

> WALLEY/KALYNCHUK: That Council approve the document Vision 2025: From Spirit to Action, with the amendment to the section on "People", as the new institutional vision document of the University of Saskatchewan.
>
> CARRIED (50 in favour, 5 opposed)

10. Planning and priorities committee and academic programs committee

10.1 Report for information: Joint report on disestablishment processes of Council

Dr. Walley and Dr. Dobson provided the presentation to Council on the role the planning and priorities (PPC) and academic programs committees (APC) play with respect to the disestablishment processes of Council. Council was advised that the report contained in the written meeting materials includes important attachments as well as links to provide further information and background. The University of Saskatchewan Act is the definitive legislation governing disestablishment, supplemented by Council and committee guidelines.

Dr. Dobson noted that recommendations are to come to Council for program additions, major program revisions and program deletions. APC can approve minor programs but is to report to Council for information.

Dr. Dobson advised that historically, the characteristics of programs considered for termination include: continually low student enrolment; inactivity for longer than five years; significant program weakness in one or more of teaching, research and scholarly work or other activities specific to the program; and persistent lack of necessary resources or inefficient use of available resources.

Dr. Dobson also noted the program termination assessment criteria. He explained that if Council approves of the disestablishment of an academic unit, confirmation is sought from Senate, and the Board of Governors is authorized by Council to disestablish the unit. He noted that the university is not in a financial exigency situation now but even if this was the situation, the Board of Governors is required to consult with Council. Dr. Walley advised that PPC would also be involved in academic unit amalgamation. If a departmental amalgamation requires no new resources, the decision remains with Council and does not require Board approval. The authority to disestablish or amalgamate an academic unit is a decision made by Council. As a result, faculty council approval is not required, but would be of interest to PPC and Council. PPC also has the right to consult with other faculty councils or college committees. Dr. Walley noted that the university does not often disestablish academic units or amalgamate departments so there is not much guidance in this area and that PPC will consider developing guidelines that will be used to provide similar guidance that APC has for program deletions. Given the rarity for college and school disestablishments, PPC will not develop specific guidelines for the disestablishment of entities at this level, and these items will continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The chair invited questions to be sent by email to the university secretary and noted that a copy of the presentation would be posted on the university secretary web site.

11. Academic programs committee

Dr. Roy Dobson, chair of the academic programs committee presented these reports to Council.

11.1 Request for Decision: Four-year and honours degree, biology and biotechnology- program termination

Dr. Dobson noted that this program was initially established as part of the Virtual College of Biotechnology. The program has been disbanded and no longer in the calendar. The responsible faculty member is no longer available to contribute to this program and it no longer serves academic needs. All students in the program will be able to finish their programs.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the termination of the honours and four-year degree in biology and biotechnology, effective September 2014.

CARRIED

11.2 Request for Decision: Four-year and honours degree, biomolecular structure studies – program termination

Dr. Dobson advised that the biomolecular program has no student enrolment, faculty support or funding.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the termination of the honours and four-year degree in biomolecular structure studies, effective September 2014.

CARRIED

12. Research, scholarly and artistic work committee

12.1 Report for information: undergraduate research

Dr. Caroline Tait, chair of the research, scholarly and artistic work committee asked that this item be moved to be considered at the next Council meeting, to which the chair agreed.

13. Other business

There was no other business.

14. Question period

There were no questions.

15. Adjournment

PARKINSON/CHANG: That the meeting be adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

CARRIED

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, May 22, 2014

COUNCIL ATTENDANCE 2013-14

Voting Participants

Name	Sept 19	Oct 24	Nov 21	Dec 19	Jan 23	Feb 27	Mar 20	Apr 17	May 22	June 19
Albritton, William	P	P	R	P	P	P	P	P		
Anand, Sanjeev	R	P	P	P	P	P	R	P		
Bartley, William	P	P	A	P	P	P	A	A		
Baxter-Jones, Adam	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Berlinic, Wyatt	R	P	R	R	P	P	R	A		
Berry, Lois	P	P	A	P	R	P	R	P		
Bonham-Smith, Peta	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Brenna, Bev	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Brenna, Dwayne	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	P		
Brooke, James	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Buhr, Mary	P	R	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Busch-Vischniac, Ilene	R	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Calvert, Lorne	R	R	P	R	R	A	P	A		
Chang, Gap Soo	P	P	R	P	P	P	A	P		
Chibbar, Ravindra	P	P	R	P	R	P	P	P		
Crowe, Trever	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Daum Shanks, Signa	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	R		
Day, Moira	P	R	A	R	P	P	A	P		
de Boer, Dirk	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
D'Eon, Marcel	P	P	P	R	R	R	P	P		
DesBrisay, Gordon	R	P	P	P	P	R	P	P		
Deters, Ralph	A	P	P	R	P	P	P	P		
Deutscher, Tom	A	A	P	P	P	P	R	R		
Dick, Rainer	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Dobson, Roy	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Eberhart, Christian	A	A	A	A	R	A	A	A		
Fairbairn, Brett	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Findlay, Len	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Flynn, Kevin	R	P	A	P	P	P	R	A		
Freeman, Doug	P	R	A	A	R	R	R	R		
Gabriel, Andrew	A	R	P	R	A	A	A	P		
Ghezelbash, Masoud	P	R	P	R	P	P	A	P		
Gobbett, Brian	A	P	A	A	P	A	A	A		
Goncalves Sebastiao, Bruno	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		
Greer, Jim	A	P	P	P	P	R	P	R		
Gyurcsik, Nancy	NYA	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Haines, Aleina							R	A		
Hamilton, Murray	P	P	A	A	P	A	P	P		
Harrison, Liz	P	P	A	P	R	R	R	P		
Heidel, Steven	P	P	A	A	P	P	A	A		
Heinz, Shawn	P	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		
Herriot, Jon	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		
Hill, David	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	R		
James-Cavan, Kathleen	P	P	R	P	P	P	P	R		
Johanson, Robert	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Jones, Paul	P	P	P	R	P	P	R	P		
Kalra, Jay	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Kalynchuk, Lisa	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P		
Khandelwal, Ramji	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P		
Kipouros, Georges	A	P	P	R	R	P	A	A		
Klaasen, Frank	P	P	A	A	P	P	P	A		
Konchak, Peter	NYA	P	P	P	P	P	R	P		
Krol, Ed	P	P	P	R	P	P	P	P		

Name	Sept 19	Oct 24	Nov 21	Dec 19	Jan 23	Feb 27	Mar 20	Apr 17	May 22	June 19
Kulshreshtha, Surendra	P	P	P	A	A	P	A	A		
Ladd, Ken	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Langhorst, Barbara	P	R	P	P	R	R	A	R		
Lee, Deborah	P	P	P	R	P	P	R	P		
Lieverse, Angela	P	A	P	R	P	P	R	P		
Lin, Yen-Han	R	A	P	R	R	R	A	P		
Lindemann, Rob	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	P		
Luo, Yu	P	R	P	R	A	A	A	A		
MacGregor, Michael	A	R	P	P	A	P	A	P		
Makaroff, Dwight	P	P	P	R	P	P	P	P		
Makarova, Veronika	P	P	A	P	A	P	P	A		
Meda, Venkatesh	P	P	P	R	P	P	R	P		
Michelmann, Hans	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Miller, Borden	A	A	A	A	A	P	A	A		
Montgomery, James	A	P	R	A	A	P	A	P		
Noble, Bram	P	R	P	P	R	P	P	P		
Ogilvie, Kevin	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		
Ohiozebau. Ehimai	P	P	P	R	P	P	R	P		
Ovsenek, Nick	A	P	P	A	P	P	P	P		
Parkinson, David	A	R	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Phoenix, Aaron	P	R	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Pozniak, Curtis	P	P	R	A	P	A	A	P		
Pritchard, Stacy	R	R	A	R	R	A	A	A		
Prytula, Michelle	P	P	R	P	A	R	P	A		
Pywell, Rob	P	P	P	P	P	R	P	P		
Racine, Louise	P	R	P	P	R	R	P	P		
Radomske, Dillan	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		
Rangacharyulu, Chary	P	P	R	P	R	P	A	P		
Regnier, Robert	A	A	A	P	A	A	P	A		
Rigby, John	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Robertson, Jordan	P	P	P	R	P	A	A	A		
Rodgers, Carol	P	R	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Sarjeant-Jenkins, Rachel	R	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Schwab, Benjamin	R	P	A	A	P	A	A	A		
Schwier, Richard	A	P	P	R	P	P	P	P		
Singh, Jaswant	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	A		
Solose, Kathleen	P	P	A	R	P	P	P	P		
Still, Carl	P	P	P	R	P	R	P	P		
Stoicheff, Peter	R	P	P	R	P	P	P	P		
Sutherland, Ken	R	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Taras, Daphne	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	P		
Taylor-Gjevre, Regina	P	P	R	P	P	R	P	P		
Tyler, Robert	P	P	P	P	P	R	P	R		
Van Kessel, Andrew	A	A	A	P	A	P	A	P		
Vassileva, Julita	A	P	P	A	P	P	P	P		
Voitkovska, Ludmilla	A	A	A	A	A	P	A	P		
Waldram, James	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	A		
Walker, Keith	P	P	P	P	P	R	P	P		
Walley, Fran	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Wang, Hui	P	R	P	R	R	P	A	R		
Wilson, Virginia	P	P	P	R	R	P	R	P		
Wotherspoon, Terry	P	A	R	P	P	R	P	P		

COUNCIL ATTENDANCE 2013-14

Non-voting participants

Name	Sept 19	Oct 24	Nov 21	Dec 19	Jan 23	Feb 27	Mar 20	Apr 17	May 22	June 19
Chad, Karen	A	R	R	P	P	P	R	P		
Cram, Bob	p	P	P	P	P	R	P	R		
Downey, Terrence	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	R		
FineDay, Max	R	P	P	R	P	R	R	P		
Fowler, Greg	P	R	R	P	R	P	P	P		
Isinger, Russ	P	P	R	P	P	P	P	P		
Krismer, Bob	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	R		
Magotiaux, Heather	P	R	R	R	R	P	R	R		
Schriml, Ron	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		
Sherbino, Jordan	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	R		
Vlahu, Isabela	A	A	A	P	A	P	A	R		
Williamson, Elizabeth	P	P	P	R	P	P	P	P		

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

May 2014

Presidential Travels

Provincial Tours – Swift Current and Prince Albert

Provincial tours are coming to an end for the season, wrapping up with two trips in opposite directions. On April 29th we went south to Swift Current and on May 6th we went north to Prince Albert. Having done a few of these tours now we are getting into a familiar, but important, rhythm with the itinerary.

We often make stops at the local health regions/hospitals where we connect with students, faculty and staff from our nursing, pharmacy, medicine and other health-related programs. We meet with other post-secondary education partners such as Great Plains College in Swift Current or with our own program leads such as our satellite offices on the SIAST woodland campus in P.A. I usually get the opportunity to address the local chamber of commerce or other community club in the area. Whenever possible we also meet with the local tribal council or Aboriginal authority. We always end each day with a reception for alumni and friends in the area. I find these events particularly important as it allows me to connect with our most fervent supporters and understand how what is happening on our campuses is being perceived in the community.

National Tours – Calgary and Toronto

National tours tend to have a slightly different focus from provincial tours although alumni and supporters remain at their heart. These trips tend to last, on average, three to five days and involve one-on-one meetings with donors, alumni receptions, student recruitment events and, when appropriate, meetings with government officials. These trips are important as they allow university officials, myself included, to connect with alumni who are far from home, help recruit soon-to-be alumni, and garner support for the University. It wouldn't be unusual for me to spend one week out of every six dedicated to these activities.

It is important to add that for both provincial, national, and international trips that it is becoming more common to include our deans. As senior leaders, deans have an important role to play in building external relationships with alumni, supporters, prospective students and government. A coordinated team effort in these endeavours is important for the future of the University of Saskatchewan, particularly for fund-raising. I want to thank the deans and for those that assist in coordinating these important activities. Deans Taras, Hill and Stoicheff accompanied the group that visited Calgary. Deans Hill, Berry, and Smith accompanied me to Swift Current.

U15 and AUCC Meetings

As of the writing of this report I am scheduled to attend the U15 executive heads meeting in Ottawa on May 15th and 16th. In addition to our regular meeting the group of executive heads will have the opportunity to meet with Prime Minister Harper.

On May 17th, at AUCC's request, I will be participating in a strategic planning session for the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). IDRC is a crown corporation and its mandate is to help developing countries find solutions to their problems. It encourages, supports, and conducts research in the world's developing regions, and seeks to apply new knowledge to the economic and social improvement of those regions.

Grand Opening of Health Sciences D & E Wing

The official grand opening of the Health Sciences D & E wings took place on May 8th. Planning for this project began over a decade ago, built on the theme of inter-professional teaching and learning to create a holistic, patient-centered approach to education, research and clinical practice.

The future of health care is not a solo journey. Rather, complex health issues need to be addressed from many angles, to give a multi-perspective, interdisciplinary approach to patient-centered research and clinical care. With a full complement of health science disciplines on campus the whole truly is greater than the sum of its parts at the University of Saskatchewan. We do better than many of our peers on large, complicated, collaborative projects. The Health Sciences building unites our health professionals under one roof to promote collaborative research. It is a shining example of our vision for the future of the U of S, a future that will bring together diverse disciplines from across campus to address issues of critical importance.

The University of Saskatchewan received overwhelming support for the completion of these wings. The Government of Saskatchewan recognized the importance of our vision by making the largest financial commitment to date—more than $300M.With the potential to unite education and health, and shape the future of health care in the province, Saskatchewan philanthropists Leslie and Irene Dubé donated $10 million to the U of S. In recognition of this outstanding generosity, we have named the new health sciences library, and lecture theatre after the Dubés.

Saskatchewan Honors Advisory Council

By virtue of my position, I am a member of the Saskatchewan Honors Advisory Council (SHAC). Every year, the SHAC recommends recipients for the Saskatchewan Order of Merit, Saskatchewan Volunteer Medal and the Saskatchewan Distinguished Service Award. The council also provides the government with advice on provincial honours. The Chief of Protocol acts as Secretary of the Council which has 10 members including

- a chairperson appointed by the President of the Executive Council for a three-year term;
- four "ex officio" members: the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan and the Chief Justice of Queen's Bench, alternating with each other for two-year terms; the Cabinet Secretary or the Clerk of the Executive Council; the President of the University of Saskatchewan or the President of the University of Regina, alternating with each other for two-year terms; and the Provincial Archivist;

- not more than five members from the community appointed by the President of the Executive Council for three-year terms; and
- a non-voting secretary.

The council meets on an as needed basis which has seemed to amount to only a few meetings a year.

AGENDA ITEM NO: 6

PROVOST'S REPORT TO COUNCIL

May 2014

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning (PCIP)
PCIP met three times in April. On April 4, PCIP had a retreat to discuss the TransformUS projects to be in the TransformUS action plan and to refine the documentation to be used to convey these projects to the campus community and project leaders. On April 14, PCIP discussed the projected actual results for the 2013/14 operating budget, the 2014/15 detailed budget and refined the TransformUS action plan and project briefs. At the April 28 PCIP meeting, the TransformUS action plan and supporting documents were reviewed and approved.

The TransformUS action plan was released to the campus community on April 30. Project briefs to support the 40 projects and subprojects outlined in the action plan, along with a document indicating how PCIP addressed all of the recommendations of the two task forces, were released on May 1. For more information and to view the action plan and supporting elements, visit transformus.usask.ca.

An initial meeting of project leaders was held on 7 May. The projects are getting underway at different speeds, with those in the vice-presidential offices and administrative central units generally proceeding quickest.

The plan will be presented for information to council at this meeting by Planning and Priorities Committee. PCIP is interested in general reactions from council members, which will help guide the plan implementation and the shaping of the draft project briefs.

VICE-PROVOST TEACHING AND LEARNING

Undergraduate Student Engagement and Innovative approach behind the success of Indigenous Philosophy Class

Dr. Daniel Regnier, professor and department head of philosophy at St. Thomas More College, and senior undergraduate student of philosophy Erica Lee collaborated in the innovative, co-designed and co-taught 2012/13 offering of Phil 115: Indigenous Philosophy. The class was offered as part of the Aboriginal Student Achievement Program. Regnier felt it would be neither ethical nor effective to approach teaching Indigenous philosophy in the same way that a traditional, western philosophy class would be taught at the first year level. To solve the ethical problem of a non-Aboriginal philosopher teaching Indigenous philosophy to Aboriginal students, Regnier worked with Lee, who identifies herself as Nehiyaw (Plains Cree) and is a volunteer Peer Mentor with ASAP. Together, Regnier and Lee developed a non-traditional class that modeled tenets of Indigenous philosophy as a practice. For instance, they consulted and involved the on- and off-campus Aboriginal community in teaching the class, which acknowledged the importance of community and resulted in many guest speakers who

shared their knowledge with the students. The class was innovative because it demonstrated a successful mentorship model for undergraduate scholarship and teaching, while actively including the Aboriginal community in a class that is, at its core, about Aboriginal ways of knowing and being in the world.

Open Access Textbook Symposium with Mary Burgess of BC Campus

On Tuesday, April 29 the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning hosted a symposium regarding open access textbooks. The provincial government supported this financially allowing us to invite expert Mary Burgess to speak on campus. Mary Burgess is the Director of Open Education at BCcampus. Mary's portfolio includes the BC Open Textbook Project and other Open Educational Resource initiatives, as well as the professional learning offerings and educational communities of practice support delivered by BCcampus. Prior to her work at BCcampus, Mary worked at several institutions as an instructional design, and educational technology leader. The session answered such questions as: What is an Open Educational Resource? What is an Open Textbook? How can they improve the learning experiences of students? It was also an opportunity to learn about the BC Open Textbook project and other open initiatives that save students money and enable faculty more control over their instructional resources. The symposium is part of the work Patti McDougall is doing with Max FineDay (USSU President) and Jim Greer (Director, ULC/GMCTE) to increase the adoption of open resources at the University of Saskatchewan. The adoption of these kinds of resources is also supported by the provincial government. Such resources increase access to education as textbooks are a very expensive part of the higher education experience. Learn more about the work of Mary Burgess and BCcampus here: http://open.bccampus.ca/

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER AND ASSOCIATE VICE-PRESIDENT, INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

The following is submitted by Mark Roman, Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice-President, Information and Communications Technology (CIO and AVP, ICT)…

I feel like I have I arrived at the UofS at an opportune moment. This time of significant transformation is also a time of great opportunity for ICT where we will see substantive and broad information systems change. It is the ideal time for a new CIO to begin. To prepare for this transition I developed a 90-day personal plan identifying 10 signature activities I need to perform. Each activity has a series of measurable objectives to assess success at the end of my first 3 months. Implementing the plan started with getting to know everyone through 1:1 meetings, small group sessions, and three ICT town halls. I have had the wonderful opportunity to meet literally hundreds of amazing people throughout the university, and I have also focused on developing new relationships with strategic users of information systems. I have met almost every dean and expect to finish these meetings fairly soon.

As I listened to folks across the institution I began to work with the ICT leadership team to develop a model for stewardship and governance designed to engage key stakeholders in information systems decision-making and prioritization. We are just beginning to socialize this model with our stakeholder community. To support this stewardship model we have initiated the development of a project portfolio office and a new project management process to improve the quality, reliability, and trustworthiness of all information systems initiatives. These new processes are being used to support the development of

our ICT TransformUS plan, and the first draft of this plan is already in development. We are also initiating new processes to improve the quality and reliability of information systems production services through the implementation of industry standard better practices.

As we look to the future of information systems at the UofS, we are beginning to envision a world where there is one core system to support all of our administrative processes, one integrated ecosystem of teaching and learning technologies, and one dynamic and flexible source of research computing infrastructure and support. We aspire to create a unified information systems environment for all of our stakeholders.

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT RESEARCH

The research highlights for the month of May are reported in the attachment by the office of the vice-president, research.

SEARCHES AND REVIEWS

Review, Dean, Western College of Veterinary Medicine
The review committee for the Dean, Western College of Veterinary Medicine met in early April. Requests for feedback submissions have been sent out.

Review, Dean, Edwards School of Business
The review committee for the Dean, Edwards School of Business met in mid-April. Requests for feedback submissions will be sent out shortly.

Partnerships

Minerals Partnership Announced

Saskatchewan's International Minerals Innovation Institute (IMII), Mitacs, and the U of S are partnering on a novel research and training initiative through an investment valued at more than $600,000. For more information, visit *http://goo.gl/jbcfl8*.

$2M for Woodland Caribou Study

Philip McLoughlin and **Jill Johnstone** (Biology) have launched a five-year study of Northern Saskatchewan's woodland caribou population and habitat worth more than $2 million. The project is funded through a partnership between the U of S, Environment Canada, and industrial partners with further support from NSERC. For more information, visit: *http://goo.gl/q3Lt9E*.

Engineering Partnership with Queen's

The College of Engineering and its counterpart at Queen's University have signed a letter of intent to develop mutually beneficial linkages in mining engineering and minerals processing. For more information, visit *http://goo.gl/ROMcW1*.

Cyclotron Component Delivered

The cyclotron facility's 'magnetic heart' was delivered on April 22nd. Saskatchewan's first cyclotron is under construction and will be operated through U of S's partnership with the Sylvia Fedoruk Canadian Centre for Nuclear Innovation. For more information, visit *http://goo.gl/tROv8L*.

International Agreements Signed

The U of S signed agreements with five international partners:

- A Memorandum of Understanding was signed on April 3rd with **Galilee College** in the Bahamas.
- An Implementation Plan regarding student and faculty exchange with the **University of Ankara** in Turkey was finalized on April 16th.
- A Memorandum of Understanding was signed on April 1st with the **Universidad de Valparaiso** in Chile.
- A Letter of Intent was signed on April 10th with the **Universidade Federal De Minas Gerais** in Brazil.
- A Memorandum of Understanding was signed on April 10th with **Escuela Politecnica Nacional** in Ecuador.

Reputational Successes

GIFS Appoints First Enhancement Chair

The Global Institute for Food Security has appointed **David Natcher** (Bioresource Policy, Business & Economics) as **GIFS Research Chair in the Social Dimensions of Food Security**. Natcher's five-year appointment – the first since GIFS' establishment – will draw upon his experience working with indigenous communities in Saskatchewan and around the world. For more information, visit: *http://goo.gl/rXOCSC*.

Staff Appointed to NSERC Committee

Susan Blum, Director of Research Services, has been appointed to the NSERC Prairies Regional Office Advisory Committee for a one-year term.

Funding Successes

Summer Research Assistants Appointed

The **Undergraduate Research Initiative** has awarded 76 Undergraduate Summer Research Assistantships to applicants from 13 different colleges and units. The $2000 and $4000 matching grants aid researchers in providing an undergraduate student with a research experience during the summer.

Student Internships Awarded

U of S researchers were awarded two $15,000 **Mitacs Accelerate Graduate Research Internships** for their graduate students and postdoctoral fellows:

- **Richard Bowles** (Computer Science) received an internship with DragonWave Inc for student Sheida Ahmadi for the project "*Separating Mixtures Using Single-File and Dual-Mode Diffusion*" .
- **David Klymyshyn** (Electrical and Computer Engineering) received an internship with DragonWave Inc for student Mohammadreza Tayfeh Aligodarz for the project "*Antenna Array Feasibility Study*".

Support for Experiental Training Program

Baljit Singh (Veterinary Biomedical Sciences) received $375,000 from the **Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture**'s Agriculture Development Fund for the project "*Experiental Discovery and Learning Program in Large Animal Veterinary Medicine*". The funding will support an experiential summer research and training program for students in veterinary medicine.

NSERC Engage Grants Awarded

Twenty-eight U of S researchers were awarded 33 NSERC Engage Grants, bringing more than $800,000 in research funding to the university. Each successful project was awarded a total of approximately $25,000 from NSERC and an industry partner.

One Health Initiative Funds New Projects

The U of S **One Health Initiative** has awarded four interdisciplinary teams a One Health Research Development Grant, worth up to $20,000 each. The awards help establish early-stage research projects in the One Health signature area, positioning teams for future success in major external competitions. Funding comes from PCIP and the Council of Health Science Deans. The successful applicants were:

- **Murray Drew** (Animal and Poultry Science) for the project "*Community-based pond aquaculture in southern Ethiopia – A One Health systems approach integrating human, animal, and environmental health factors*".
- **Vikram Misra** (Veterinary Microbiology) for the project "*Zoonotic Viruses in Canadian Bats*".
- **Pammla Petrucka** (Nursing) for the project "*Join the C2OHRIS: Citizen Centres for One Health Research, Innovation and Surveillance*".
- **Joseph E. Rubin** (Veterinary Microbiology) for the project "*Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus at Royal University Hospital: animal associated risk factors for colonization*".

Supporting Cancer Research

Three U of S researchers were awarded **Saskatchewan Cancer Agency** research grants:

- **Deborah Anderson** (Oncology) was awarded $200,000 for the project "*Regulation of PTEN in Breast Cancer Cells*".
- **Franco Vizeacoumar** (Oncology) was awarded $200,000 for the project "*Exploiting the Defective Genome of the Cancer Cells by Synthetic Lethality*".
- **Jim (Jianhua) Xiang** (Oncology) was awarded $199,474 for the project "*Novel HER2-specific T cell-based Vaccine Expressing Potent Th Epitope P30 for Enhanced Therapeutic Immunity against Trastuzumab-resistant HER2-positive Breast Cancer*".

Funding for Research Infrastructure

Five U of S projects were awarded a total of $557,109 from the **Canada Foundation for Innovation** John R. Evans Leaders Fund. The projects will bring nearly $1.4 million in infrastructure improvements.

- **Terra Arnason** (Medicine) and **Troy Harkness** (Anatomy & Cell Biology) were awarded $51,699 for "*Q-PROOF: Quantitative Protein and RNA Facility to study entry to and exit from drug resistant cancers*".
- **Oon-Doo Baik** (Chemical & Biological Engineering) was awarded $60,869 for "*Versatile pilot scale radio frequency system for food and bioprocess research*".
- **Matthew Lindsay** (Geological Sciences) was awarded $37,043 for "*Portable gas chromatography to Support biogeochemical investigations of closure technologies for oil sands mines*".
- **Janeen Loehr** (Psychology) was awarded $177,721 for "*EEG Hyperscanning Laboratory (EHL) for the cognitive and clinical neuroscience of inter-brain coordination*".
- **Daniel MacPhee** (Veterinary Biomedical Sciences) was awarded $229,777 for "*Live cell imaging microscope for research in reproductive and developmental biology*".

Funding for Toxicology Equipment

Karsten Liber, **John Giesy**, **Paul Jones and Markus Hecker** (Toxicology Centre) received $835,341 from **Western Economic Diversification Canada** for their project "*Analytical Toxicology Base in Support of Economic Development*". The funding will contribute to the purchase of highly specialized equipment used to identify and quantify the chemical constituents of oil-sands process-affected water.

Pulse Crop Research Funded

Bunyamin Tar'an (Crop Development Centre) received $557,260 for "*A Reverse-Introgression and Genomics Strategy to Develop and Characterize Chickpea Germplasm for Yield and Climate-Resilience Traits*". The funding is provided by the Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture's Agriculture Development Fund, the Saskatchewan Pulse Crop Development Board and the Western Grains Research Foundation.

RUH Funds Six Projects

Six U of S researchers were awarded a **Royal University Hospital Foundation** (RUHF) grant:

- **G. Camelia Adams** (Psychiatry) received $24,578 for the project "*The Relationship between Attachment, Treatment Compliance, and Treatment Outcomes in Patients with Obstructive Sleep Apnea*".
- **Cathy Arnold** (Physical Therapy) received $24,997 for the project "*Does Fall Arrest Strategy Training (FAST) Added to a Fall Prevention Program Improve Balance, Strength, and Agility in Older Women? - A Pilot Study*".
- **Lawrence Brawley** (Kinesiology) received $25,000 for the project "*Examination of Proxy Reliance and Problem-Solving Relative to Exercise Self-Management among Cardiac Rehabilitation Initiates*".
- **Jennifer Jones** (Gastroenterology) received $24,318.57 for the project "*Flaxseed Lignan-enriched Complex (FLC) for the Treatment of Patients with Mild to Moderately Severe Ulcerative Colitis (UC): A Pilot Assessment*".
- **Mela Mansfield** (Psychiatry) received $24,660.00 for the project "*Intervention for Forensic Psychiatric Outpatients in Royal University Hospital with Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)*".
- **Helen Nichol** (Anatomy and Cell Biology) received $25,000 for the project "*Plasma Metalloprotein Biomarkers of Multiple Sclerosis*".

Funding for Cystic Fibrosis Research

Two U of S researchers were successful in receiving a **Cystic Fibrosis Canada** Research Grant:

- **Darryl Adamko** (Pediatrics) was awarded $15,000 for the project "*Improved Diagnosis and Management of CF: A Pilot Study to Develop a Metabolomic Approach to Cystic Fibrosis*".
- **Juan Ianowski** (Physiology) was awarded $222,327 for the project "*Inhalation of Pseodomonas Aeruginosa Triggers CFTR-Mediated Mucus Secretion in Swine Airway*".

AGENDA ITEM NO: 8.1

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY and ARTISTIC WORK COMMITTEE

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

PRESENTED BY: Caroline Tait, Chair, Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: **Report on Undergraduate Research**

COUNCIL ACTION: For information only

PURPOSE:

The Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee terms of reference call upon the committee to recommend to Council on issues and strategies to support research, scholarly and artistic work, and to provide advice to the Vice-President Research, the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning, and Dean of Graduate Studies and Research on the contributions of undergraduate and graduate students and post-doctoral fellows to the research activity of the University. In keeping with its terms of reference, the attached report summarizes and reports on the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee's discussions on the university's initiative to more firmly establish undergraduate research within the undergraduate curriculum.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee Report to Council: Undergraduate Research Initiative

Research, Scholarly, and Artistic Work Committee
Report to Council: Undergraduate Research Initiative

1. Purpose of the report:

Toward an Engaged University: The Second Integrated Plan 2008/09 – 2011/12 sets out the goal of the ***"engagement of students in research and discovery"*** as follows:

> *The full potential of a research-engaged university is realized when students experience discovery and creative inquiry first-hand…Increasingly, a goal of our instructional design will be to provide students with authentic research experiences including modeling and mentoring by faculty as well as direct experience individually and in groups…We will not have succeeded, however, if we do not ensure that the vast majority of our undergraduate students have opportunities to experience research and discovery for themselves…. [and] have an opportunity to participate in a research project directly related to their program of study at least once during their academic career.*

The following report summarizes a series of discussions held by the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work (RSAW) committee that began in earnest in Fall 2013 and serves as follow up to committee discussions held in previous years about the enhancement of undergraduate research at the University of Saskatchewan. This academic year, RSAW set out to learn more about the university driven initiative in undergraduate research headed by the Vice-President of Research and in collaboration with the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning, and the University Learning Centre. The goal of this new initiative is to provide research opportunities to all undergraduate students across all university colleges. The RSAW committee elected to hear from the administrative units who are directly involved in promoting and advancing the initiative, and from undergraduate students and faculty members who are currently or have in the past been engaged in undergraduate research activities. The committee thanks these individuals for their time and particularly for discussing the benefits and challenges of undergraduate research in a frank and open manner. In the future, RSAW plans to hear directly from faculty and students involved in the pilot projects that are underway now and those implemented in 2014/15 academic year, at which time RSAW will update Council again about the initiative.

This report outlines a series of specific and practical suggestions bought forward by the RSAW committee and poses questions where we believe further discussion and consideration is needed. For simplicity, this document uses the word "research" as a proxy for "research, scholarly, and artistic work." Importantly, the intent of the document is not to critique the efforts of those involved in advancing undergraduate research but to provide information and advice to Council and proponents based on the committee's exploration of the initiative. As such, the report is meant to inform, reinforce, and complement the work that has occurred to date. The RSAW committee will continue to keep up-to-date about advancement of this initiative, and this report should be viewed as a current update to Council on an initiative that will be followed by RSAW into the future.

2. Summary of efforts to date engaging undergraduate students in research:

The offices of the Vice-President Research, the Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning, and the University Learning Centre are leading the advancement of the university's initiative to systematically engage in undergraduate research. In 2010, an interdisciplinary task force was

created to develop a framework to engage undergraduate students in discovery and creation opportunities, resulting in the submission of a paper entitled, *Undergraduate Research Opportunities*. The paper consists of an environmental scan of successful approaches used at other institutions to promote undergraduate research and a series of recommendations on strategies to advance undergraduate research at the University of Saskatchewan. Consultation on the report occurred with key bodies across campus, including the Associate Deans Research Forum, Deans' Council, the [then] Teaching and Learning committee of Council, and the RSAW committee.

In 2011, PCIP awarded $400,000 in permanent funding to advance the undergraduate research initiative. The initiative focuses primarily on course-based experiences for undergraduate research and involves curricular revision and development based upon the goal of embedding an undergraduate research experience within the curriculum from the first through to fourth year. Expansion of student opportunities outside of the classroom (e.g. cooperative placements, internships, and research assistantships) and active promotion of knowledge translation of undergraduate research through various activities [e.g. poster presentations, undergraduate research journal] will be a central development of this initiative.

In approaching the challenge of making undergraduate research a priority in educational training at the University of Saskatchewan, the leadership team recognized the need to engage colleges and invite them to become champions of the initiative. As a start three colleges/divisions were invited to participate in curricular pilot projects focused on core "gateway" courses. These included the College of Kinesiology, the College of Agriculture and Bio-resources, and the Social Sciences Division, College of Arts and Science. Fifteen members of faculty agreed to participate in the pilot and introduce an undergraduate project into a 100-level course. A curriculum coach was hired to support faculty members in designing course content and a fundamental principle was adopted; "research is about asking questions and using the methods of a discipline to find answers and communicate results". It was felt this principle could be equally applied in a first-year class or a senior undergraduate class. In addition, senior undergraduate and graduate students were hired as research coaches for students. The role of the research coaches is to support faculty instructors by providing mentorship to students enrolled in the courses. In January 2014, the first of these courses – two sections of SOC 111 were taught, engaging a total of 340 students. Other faculty involved in the pilot project are currently developing undergraduate research courses for roll out in the first and second terms of the 2014-15 academic year. The planned assessment by the leadership team will determine the viability and success of the first three college level pilot projects and the potential for broader application.

3. The benefits:

The benefits of engaging undergraduate students in research are manifold to the university's mandate and to the student—undergraduate and graduate—and faculty bodies.

a) Recruitment and retention:

The undergraduate research initiative has the potential to be a distinguishing feature of the undergraduate experience at the University of Saskatchewan and serve as a recruitment and retention tool. As our goal is to recruit top level undergraduate students from within the province and beyond, offering a well crafted undergraduate research experience will be an attractive feature to students when making their decision of where to attend university.

The committee speculated that engaging in undergraduate research could be a positive and powerful part of a student's undergraduate experience. For students who are less comfortable initially with university education and engagement, having opportunities to participate in research may serve as a protective measure that increases their interest in their education, improves their academic performance and prevents them from considering dropping out. The committee felt that because of the level of engagement required and purposeful linking of undergraduate research to "real life" impacts, a greater sense of identity, belonging, and meaningful contribution could occur for undergraduate students. Assessment and evaluation of the undergraduate research experience will determine the degree to which this is true and identify areas and strategies that could utilize the undergraduate research experience to reduce student drop out and increase academic achievement.

b) Equal opportunity:

Undergraduate research has been a priority of the USSU for a number of years and they have been involved with the development and visioning of this initiative as an equal opportunity education experiences for all undergraduate students. While endorsed by the USSU (see USSU briefing document on Undergraduate Research), a curriculum-based approach to undergraduate research seeks to enhance undergraduate education at the University of Saskatchewan in new and innovative ways. By providing undergraduate students with a number of experiences throughout their program, students will gain a better understanding of the scope of research questions, methodologies, techniques, processes, and outcomes. Under the umbrella of undergraduate research, independent analytical and critical thought will be enhanced for all undergraduates and better prepare students to actively select graduate studies as a career pathway and/or prepare them for employment post-graduation. Embedding undergraduate research within the curriculum from the first year is expected to remove the mystique of research as something that takes place outside of the classroom or as an activity done by only a select few undergraduate students in honours programs.

c) Building a research culture:

The University of Saskatchewan is one of the U15 universities in Canada and as such is undertaking strategies to build a cross-college research culture that involves all students who attend the university. When faculty members describe the scope of their research field to undergraduate students in the classroom, research becomes more accessible and is enhanced further when students have the opportunity to take part in their own research development and application. When faculty and graduate student assistants work alongside undergraduate students on a research project, the students receive mentoring in research that has not up until now been available across all colleges and units. As one of the U15 universities in Canada, the entrenchment of research activities in undergraduate curriculum should foster a culture of research that positively impacts all colleges. Providing undergraduate students with the opportunity to showcase and present their research to peers and mentors builds accomplishment and disseminates knowledge to others. The involvement of graduate students as mentors, instructors, and collaborators further builds the university's capacity, giving graduate students important experience for future employment either as a university faculty member or in whatever career path that they choose. The outcome of inter-generational mentoring and instruction (faculty➔graduate student➔undergraduate student *or* faculty➔undergraduate student) builds collegial ties that will expand the academic genealogy of the University of Saskatchewan, enhancing research and academic networks for the University of Saskatchewan across universities, industry, local and regional communities, and government.

d) Strengthening and enhancing connections with local, national, and international communities

Many undergraduate research opportunities involve partnerships (to varying degrees) with community, government, and private sector and non-profit organizations. Students may take up research that addresses a set of needs identified by research partners from outside of the university and in so doing they not only learn the process and value of engaged learning, but their work also benefits their research partners. This, in turn, strengthens the community outreach efforts of the university and positions us advantageously within the broader cultural, political, scientific, economic, and artistic landscapes.

4. The challenges:

A broad array of opinions exists regarding what is practical and feasible at the undergraduate level, and the RSAW committee carefully considered the challenges associated with the integration of undergraduate research at the level desired.

a) The challenge for faculty:

Success of undergraduate research across the student body relies upon the engagement and commitment of faculty and their respective departments and colleges. The committee feels that achieving this requires a cultural shift in how undergraduate curriculum is designed and delivered across the university. Cross-college exposure to, and discussion of enhancement of undergraduate research, occurred during the initial implementation of pilot sites with significant interest being expressed from faculty and departments. For some departments, undergraduate research is already embedded in specific courses, however, for other departments engaging in undergraduate research is a larger challenge, particularly in first- and second-year courses, and will require departments to rethink the current curriculum and the adoption of new approaches. Faculty members who spoke to our committee as well as our own committee members expressed concern that embedding undergraduate research in the curriculum requires a substantial commitment of time for faculty. Faculty require time to develop and integrate research within their undergraduate courses and to build alternate grading systems. While there appears to be openness on the part of faculty and departments to provide undergraduate research opportunities to all students, concern exists that the desired shift will inevitably result in significant time and resource pressures on faculty and departments that are already stretched to breaking points.

Faculty member participation in undergraduate research also demands time and energy beyond curriculum development, including supervisory responsibilities, logistical challenges (e.g. scheduling lab time and supervision, identification and arrangement of community placements, securing financial and human resources to undertake specific course projects), and, ensuring university ethical standards are met. For junior faculty, their primary focus should be on building a successful research program by attaining tri-agency and other research funding, and undertaking research and knowledge translation activities, specifically academic publication. At the same time, junior faculty are required to meet their department and college standards for renewal of probation, tenure, and promotion. Because of competing demands, measures must be in place to give junior faculty the optimal conditions to support both their career development and to engage in providing undergraduate research opportunities.

The curriculum of the professional colleges, such as Law and Medicine, which are already fully subscribed, makes fitting in an undergraduate research experience challenging. At the first-year level, the dense and demanding content will require judicious selection of content revision. This will also be required in disciplines where research per se is not the language of innovation and discovery. For example, in some units, entrepreneurship or artistic works account for advancement in the field and therefore an "undergraduate research experience" must reflect the framework of the unit rather than a generic (and irrelevant) understanding of "research" and research "innovation" and "discovery".

b) The importance of using a tailored approach: simplicity and the right level:

The challenge of distinguishing between research experience in the first year versus senior and upper-year courses requires careful thought to ensure the experience is a positive one and pitched at the right level. Simplicity and "do-ability" in years 1 and 2 is key to ensuring success. Therefore, research projects must be scaled appropriately and able to be completed in the time available.

Disciplinary approaches will need to be tailored to appropriate expectations. For example, community-based research activities are embedded in real-life challenges and in some areas students without training and experience in methodologies used in research with vulnerable populations can run into significant challenges if they are not under full supervision. Further, in certain areas involving research with human or animal subjects, timely submission and approval of ethics will be required. For their own and the university's protection and protection of research subjects, undergraduate students will need instruction in ethical standards and practices before being allowed to engage in research with vulnerable research subjects (human and animal) that requires review by the university's research ethics boards.

c) Funding limitations:

Granting agencies often limit the researcher's ability to provide a stipend for technical assistance or undergraduate student support, requiring that research funds be applied toward graduate student stipends. Strained departmental budgets make the additional expense of providing an undergraduate research experience, particularly field experiences a barrier. This is an even greater challenge given the current budgetary reductions the university faces. The committee heard that sessional support provided in some instances to assist with the instruction of sections of large first-year classes, with respect to coordination and delivery of a research module, is being downsized and may not be available in the future. The gap between ramping up undergraduate research and the fiscal reality that departments and colleges find themselves in was a question that the committee felt has not been fully answered, and will be something that we will continue to monitor and seek feedback about from all stakeholders.

Dissemination of research outcomes can vary significantly and depending on the needed resources and those available to faculty instructors will determine whether dissemination activities occur. Although the impact of some student research projects might be significant and the potential for ongoing application might be tremendous, if there are inadequate funds to support dissemination and knowledge transfer - workshops, publications, written, oral or on-line reporting back to communities, advertisements, etc. - then the overall value of the research will be undermined. The RSAW committee felt that dissemination was an important conclusion to the undergraduate research experience and questioned the demands that the full range of research activities (start to finish) would place upon undergraduate students. An additional concern is whether those students who because of necessity are employed while in university, and/or are parents or caregivers of

family members, will be disadvantaged, particularly if research activities such as data collection and dissemination activities require flexible hours or for them to work more frequently in teams that meet at inopportune hours for them. The committee was unable to determine how undergraduate research will impact upon these particular groups of students, if at all. We will continue to seek information about this question as the pilot projects conclude and new initiatives started.

***d) Logistics**:*

Consideration of resources – including as applicable, equipment, travel time, safety—must prevail and adequate infrastructural support made available. Group project work is often predicated upon having a set limit of participants—too few or too many students may mean the project is no longer available. Ensuring the expectations of the course (degree of work, student initiative, access to transportation, etc.) are apparent at the outset to students is important. Proximity to a research mentor is also important to enable side-by-side learning and the resolution of any conflicts should they arise.

e) Graduate student assistants:

The model of employing graduate student teaching assistants requires new resources and training to ensure graduate students also have a positive experience and that their efforts make a difference. Graduate students in interdisciplinary programs may be disadvantaged in not having affiliated undergraduate programs and efforts should be made to include them as mentors and instructors.

5. Committee recommendations:

- **Faculty be rewarded at an institutional level for developing their curriculum to encompass undergraduate research; if faculty are not rewarded, the intention to participate may evaporate in the face of competing demands and pressures, regardless of how interesting or worthwhile the initiative is.**

- **The initiative be embedded at the departmental level and individual faculty members can opt out of the initiative.**

- **The experience of undergraduate research be broadly defined, and should not be misconstrued to mean only experiential hands-on learning. Many departments and faculty regularly engage in undergraduate research whenever they offer a course on how to write a research proposal or how to research secondary sources. Other frameworks for innovation and discovery must be considered such as entrepreneurial, artistic work, and other models employed by departments.**

- **Dissemination and knowledge transfer of undergraduate research be a priority of the initiative and the participating units in order to provide students and all stakeholders with tangible outcomes.**

- **Learning outcomes be developed to measure success;**

- **Exploration continues regarding the possibility of applying academic course credits to summer research internships and research assistantships, and in doing so that practical considerations of this direction be considered, (e.g. should tuition apply? How will**

evaluation be undertaken?)

- **Individual departments and non-departmentalized colleges are encouraged to include a section that details their undergraduate research initiatives in all curriculum renewal processes.**

6. Summary:

The undergraduate research initiative at the University of Saskatchewan is an exciting and bold strategy to improve undergraduate education. It holds great promise for the university's future by improving the university's ability to attract and retain the best students in the province and beyond. Young people are by nature curious and innovative. Providing them with a range of opportunities to explore and discover throughout their undergraduate degree will create mature and accomplished graduates.

The implications of the undergraduate initiative for colleges, departments and faculty is still unclear, however more will be known once evaluation of some of the early pilot projects are completed and modification to later ones are made. This will be a learning process for all, and the RSAW committee will continue to monitor this initiative for Council, as well as providing advice and guidance to the OVPR's leadership team.

7. Further information:

Additional information can be found on the university web site as outlined below.

The Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness: Undergraduate Research and Inquiry
http://www.usask.ca/gmcte/resources/teaching/strategies_experiential/undergraduate-research-and-inquiry

The University of Saskatchewan Undergraduate Research Journal, volume 1, issue 1, February 2014
http://www.usask.ca/urj/

Research Learning Community
http://www.usask.ca/ulc/lc/research

College of Kinesiology One-Credit Undergraduate Research Experience
http://kinesiology.usask.ca/study-here/undergraduate/ocre.php

Social Sciences: Taking the Pulse of Undergraduate Research
http://www.usask.ca/gmcte/stories/2013/08/taking-pulse-undergraduate-student-research

Undergraduate Project Symposium
http://words.usask.ca/ussu/2013/11/25/undergraduate-project-symposium/
http://words.usask.ca/ussu/2014/01/20/undergraduate-project-symposium-2/

NSERC sponsored undergraduate research
http://words.usask.ca/news/2013/08/21/nserc-program-fosters-undergraduate-research-at-u-of-s/

AGENDA ITEM NO: 9.1

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

REQUEST FOR DECISION

PRESENTED BY: Ed Krol, Chair,
Nominations Committee of Council

DATE OF MEETING: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: **Committee Nominations for 2014-15**

DECISION REQUESTED:

It is recommended:

That Council approve the nominations to University Council committees, Collective Agreement committees, and other committees for 2014-15, as outlined in the attached list.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Each year, the nominations committee reviews the membership list of Council committees, those committees constituted under the Faculty Association Collective Agreement, and other university-level committees and submits a list of nominees to Council for consideration of appointment. The attached report contains this year's nominees to Council. In addition to meeting throughout the year as required, the committee met on April 14, 21 and 28, specifically to consider membership vacancies due to member rotation at the end of the academic year. The committee also communicated to a significant degree by email.

In conducting its work, the committee considers the skills and experience of nominees that in the committee's judgment would best apply to the committee, consulting as necessary. In keeping with its terms of reference to attempt to solicit nominations widely from the Council and the General Academic Assembly, each spring the committee issues a call for nominees to all deans and department heads, and posts an ad in *On Campus,* inviting volunteers to serve. The committee attempts to include individuals who are broadly representative of disciplines across campus. To the extent possible, the committee considers equity in representation and balance among members. In recommending committee chairs, the committee considers experience, leadership, continuity and commitment as key attributes of chair nominees.

ATTACHED:

2014-15 List of committees and members

May, 2014

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL COMMITTEES 2014-15

VICE-CHAIR OF COUNCIL

Nominee

Bob Tyler	**Food and Bioproduct Sciences**	**2016**
~~Hans Michelmann~~	~~Political Studies~~	~~2015~~

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Reviews and approves curriculum changes from all college; recommends major curriculum changes to Council; oversees policies relating to students and academic programs.

Nominees

For Chair **Roy Dobson (reappointment)**

New members (from GAA)

Mary Longman	**Art and Art History**	**2017**
Som Niyogi	**Biology**	**2017**
Elizabeth Snead	**Small Animal Clinical Sciences**	**2017**
One member TBA		
(sessional)		
Leslie Ehrlich	**Sociology**	**2015**

Continuing members

Council Members

Roy Dobson (Chair)	Pharmacy & Nutrition	2014
Kevin Flynn	English	2015
Robert Johanson	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2015
Jim Greer	University Learning Centre	2016
Nick Ovesnek	Biomedical Sciences	2016

General Academic Assembly Members

Sina Adl	Soil Science	2015
Alec Aitken	Geography and Planning	2015
~~Michael Bradley~~	~~Physics & Engineering Physics~~	~~2014~~
~~Dean McNeill~~	~~Music~~	~~2014~~
~~Ian McQuillan~~	~~Computer Science~~	
~~Yandou Wei~~	~~Biology~~	~~2014~~

Sessional Lecturer

~~Jarita Greyeyes~~	~~Native Studies~~	~~2014~~

Other members

Patti McDougall	[Provost designate] Vice-Provost, Teaching & Learning *(ex officio)*
Russ Isinger	University Registrar and Director of Student Services *(ex officio)*
Jeff Dumba	[VP Finance designate] Director, Student Accounts & Treasury *(ex officio)*

Undergraduate student member

Graduate student member

Resource members

Alison Pickrell	Director of Enrolment and Student Affairs
Pauline Melis	Assistant Provost, Institutional Planning and Assessment
Jacquie Thomarat	Acting Director, Budget Strategy and Planning

Secretary: Alex Beldan, Committee Coordinator, Office of the University Secretary

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Reviews Council bylaws including committee terms of reference; develops policies relating to student academic appeals and conduct.

Nominees

For Chair **Louise Racine**

New members (from Council)

Louise Racine	**Nursing**	**2017 [reappointment]**
Richard Gray	**Bioresource Policy, Business & Economics**	**2017**

Continuing members

Council Members

Lorne Calvert	St. Andrews College	2016
Louise Racine	Nursing	2014
~~Carol Rodgers (Chair)~~	~~Kinesiology~~	~~2014~~

Ex officio members

Jay Kalra	Chair, Council
Lisa Kalynchuk	Chair, Planning and Priorities Committee
Roy Dobson	Chair, Academic Programs Committee
Beth Williamson	University Secretary

Other members

Heather Heavin	[President's designate]

Resource members:

Secretary: Sheena Rowan, Executive Assistant, Office of the University Secretary

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Develops and reviews the policies, programming and strategic directions for international activities and programs.

Nominees

For Chair **Gap Soo Chang [reappointment]**

New members (from Council)

Gap Soo Chang	**Physics & Engineering Physics**	**2017 [reappointment]**
Hongming Cheng	**Sociology**	**2017**
(from GAA)		
Abraham Akkerman	**Geography and Planning**	**2017**
Jian Yang	**Pharmacy and Nutrition**	**2017**

Continuing Members

Council Members

Bill Albritton	Microbiology & Immunology	2016
Gap Soo Chang (Chair)	Physics & Engineering Physics	2014
~~Claire Card~~	~~Large Animal Clinical Sciences~~	~~2014~~

General Academic Assembly Members

Michael Cottrell	Educational Administration	2015
~~Nadeem Jamali~~	~~Computer Science~~	~~2014~~
Angela Kalinowski	History	2015
Mabood Qureshi	Pathology	2015
~~Stella Spriet~~	~~Languages & Linguistics~~	~~2014~~
~~Phil Thacker~~	~~Plant Science~~	~~2015~~

Other members

Patti McDougall [Provost designate] Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning *(ex officio)*
Harley Dickinson [designate for Vice-President Research] Strategic Advisor, International *(ex officio)*
Undergraduate student member
Graduate student member

Resource members

Alison Pickrell Director of Enrolment Services
Secretary: Alex Beldan, Committee Coordinator, Office of the University Secretary

PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

Reviewing and advising Council and the university administration on planning, budgeting, and academic priorities.

Nominees

For Chair **Lisa Kalynchuk**
New members (from GAA)

Valerie Korinek	**History**	**2017**
Marvin Britto	**Library**	**2017**
Susan Whiting	**Pharmacy and Nutrition**	**2017**
One member TBA		
(sessional)		
Leslie Walter	**Mathematics and Statistics**	**2015 [reappointment]**

Continuing members

Council Members

Bill Bartley	English	2016
Peta Bonham-Smith	Biology	2015
Dirk DeBoer	Geography and Planning	2016
Lisa Kalynchuk	Psychology	2014
Ramji Khandelwal	Biochemistry	2015
~~Venkatesh Meda~~	~~Chemical & Biological Eng~~	~~2014~~
Fran Walley	Soil Science	2015
Chary Rangacharyulu	Physics & Engineering Physics	2016

General Academic Assembly Members

~~David Janz~~	~~Vet Biomedical Sciences~~	~~2014~~
~~Jeremy Rayner~~	~~Public Policy~~	~~2014~~
~~Greg Wurzer~~	~~Library~~	~~2016~~

Dean

Sanjeev Anand	College of Law	2016

Sessional Lecturer

Leslie Walter	Mathematics and Statistics	2014

Other members

Brett Fairbairn Provost & Vice-President Academic *(ex officio)*

James Basinger	[VP Research representative] Associate Vice-President Research *(ex officio)*
Laura Kennedy	[VP Finance & Resources representative] Associate VP (Financial Services) and Controller *(ex officio)*
Heather Magotiaux	VP University Advancement (*Ex officio, non-voting)*
Desiree Steele	[USSU designate] VP Academic, USSU
Izabela Vlahu	[GSA designate] President, GSA
Resource members	
Pauline Melis	Assistant Provost, Institutional Planning & Assessment
Jacquie Thomarat	Acting Director of Budget, Planning and Strategy
Bryan Bilokreli	Director, Capital Planning
Colin Tennent	Associate VP Facilities Management
Mark Roman	Chief Information Officer and Associate VP ICT
Winona Wheeler	designate of the Special Advisor to the President on Aboriginal Initiatives

Secretary: Sandra Calver Coordinator University Governance, Office of the University Secretary

RESEARCH SCHOLARLY AND ARTISTIC WORK COMMITTEE

Reviews and advises Council on issues related to research, scholarly and artistic work including advising on research grant policies and the establishment of research centres.

Nominees

For Chair **Caroline Tait [reappointment]**

New members (from GAA)

Laurie Hellsten	**Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Education**	**2017**
Keith Willoughby	**Associate Dean, Edwards School of Business**	**2015 [reappointment]**

Continuing members

Council Members		
Yu Luo	Biochemistry	2015
Ranier Dick	Physics and Engineering Physics	2016
Jaswant Singh	Veterinary Biomedical Sciences	2015
Paul Jones	SENS	2016
~~Julita Vassileva~~	~~Computer Science~~	~~2016~~
General Academic Assembly Members		
Pamela Downe	Archaeology and Anthropology	2015
Tim Nowlin	Art and Art History	2015
Keith Willoughby	Edwards School of Business	2014
Caroline Tait (Chair)	Psychiatry	2016
Other members		
Karen Chad	Vice-President Research *(ex officio)*	
Adam Baxter-Jones	Acting Dean of Graduate Studies & Research *(ex officio)*	
Desiree Steele	[USSU designate] VP Academic, USSU	
Ranjan Datta	[GSA designate] VP Academic, GSA	
Resource members		
Susan Blum	Director, Research Services	
Laura Zink	Special Projects and Operations, Office of the Vice-President Research	

Secretary: Sandra Calver, Coordinator University Governance, Office of the University Secretary

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS COMMITTEE

Grants awards, scholarships and bursaries which are open to students of more than one college or school, advises Council on scholarship and awards policies and issues.

Nominees

For Chair **James Montgomery**

New members (from Council)

Frank Klassen	**History**	**2017**
(from GAA)		
Maxyn Chaban	**Economics**	**2017**
Bonnie Stelmach	**Educational Administration**	**2017**

Continuing members

Council Members

~~Gordon DesBrisay~~	~~Arts & Science~~	~~2014~~
James Montgomery	Small Animal Clinical Sciences	2015
Kathleen Solose	English	2016

General Academic Assembly Members

Carol Henry	Pharmacy and Nutrition	2015
~~Mehdi Nemati~~	~~Chemical & Biological Eng~~	~~2014~~
Curtis Pozniak	Plant Sciences	2016
Alexey Shevyakov	Mathematics and Statistics	2016
Sonia Udod	Nursing	2015
~~Suraj Unniappan~~	~~Veterinary Biomedical Sciences~~	~~2014~~

Other members

Alison Pickrell	[Provost designate] Director, Enrolment Services *(ex officio)*
Wendy Klingenberg	[SESD designate] Assistant Registrar, Awards and Financial Aid *(ex officio)*
Heather Lukey	[Dean of Graduate Studies and Research designate] Director of Graduate Awards and Scholarships *(ex officio)*
Heather Magotiaux	Vice-President University Advancement *(ex officio, non-voting)*
Desiree Steele	VP Academic of the USSU
Mohammad Rafati	VP Finance of the GSA
TBA	Student representative from the Aboriginal Students' Centre or a College Undergraduate Affairs Office

Resource members

Heather Lukey	Director of Graduate Awards and Scholarships
Jim Traves	Director of Finance and Trusts

Secretary: Wendy Klingenberg, Assistant Registrar, Awards and Financial Aid, SESD

TEACHING, LEARNING AND ACADEMIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Reviews and advises on pedagogical issues, support services for teaching and learning, and policy issues on teaching, learning and academic resources.

Nominees

For Chair **Jay Wilson**

New members (from Council)

Jay Wilson	**Curriculum Studies**	**2017 [reappointment]**
Matthew Paige	**Chemistry**	**2017**
(from GAA)		
Hadley Kutcher	**Crop Development Centre**	**2017**

Lachlan McWilliams	**Psychology**	**2017**
Ken Van Rees	**Soil Science**	**2017**
(sessional)		
Michael McGarity	**English, St. Thomas More**	**2015**

Continuing members

Council Members		
Bev Brenna	Curriculum Studies	2016
Kathleen James-Caven	English	2015
Aaron Phoenix	Engineering	2016
Deborah Lee	Library	2015
~~Dwight Makaroff~~	~~Computer Science~~	~~2014~~
General Academic Assembly Members		
~~John Kleefeld~~	~~Law~~	~~2014~~
Jay Wilson	Curriculum Studies	2014
Trisha Dowling	Veterinary Biomedical Sciences	2015
Alison Muri	English	2016
Marcel D'Eon	Community Health and Epidemiology	2016
~~Sandra Bassendowski~~	~~Nursing~~	~~2014~~
Sessional Lecturer		
~~Leslie Erhlich~~	~~Sociology~~	~~2014~~
Other members		
Patti McDougall	Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning	
Mark Roman	Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice President ICT	
Ken Ladd	Acting Dean, University Library	
Jim Greer	Director, University Learning Centre and Academic Lead, Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness	

Undergraduate student member
Graduate student member
Secretary: Alex Beldan, Committee Coordinator, Office of the University Secretary

STUDENT ACADEMIC HEARING AND APPEALS PANEL

From this roster, the faculty representatives for student disciplinary and appeal committees are selected. This panel is mandated by the *Council Regulations on Student Academic Misconduct*, the *Council Procedures for Student Appeals in Academic Matters*, and by the *Senate Standard of Student Conduct in Non-Academic Matters and Procedures for Resolution of Complaints and Appeals*. Only members of Council are eligible for membership on this panel.

Nominees

New members

Dwayne Brenna	**Drama**	**2017**
Alexander Ervin	**Anthropology and Archaeology**	**2017**
Len Findlay	**English**	**2017**
Tammy Marche	**Psychology, St. Thomas More**	**2017**
Lawrence Martz	**Geography and Planning**	**2017**
Rachel Sarjeant-Jenkins	**Library**	**2017**
Jaswant Singh	**Veterinary Biomedical Sciences**	**2017**
Gord Zello	**Pharmacy and Nutrition**	**2017**

Continuing members

William Albritton	Microbiology and Immunology	2015

Ravi Chibbar	Plant Sciences	2015
Moira Day	Drama	2016
Dirk de Boer	Geography and Planning	2016
Ranier Dick	Physics and Engineering Physics	2016
Liz Harrison	Physical Therapy	2015
Ramji Khandelwal	Biochemistry	2015
Ed Krol	Pharmacy & Nutrition	2015
Yen Han Lin	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2016
~~Michael Macgregor~~	~~Psychology~~	~~2016~~
~~Dwight Makaroff~~	~~Computer Science~~	~~2015~~
James Montgomery	Small Animal Clinical Sciences	2015
Bram Noble	Geography and Planning	2016
~~Nic Ovsenek~~	~~Medicine~~	~~2014~~
Michelle Prytula	Educational Administration	2016
~~Louise Racine~~	~~Nursing~~	~~2014~~
Kathleen Solose	Music	2016
~~Regina Taylor Gjevre~~	~~Rheumatology~~	~~2015~~
Fran Walley	Soil Science	2015
Terry Wotherspoon	Sociology	2015

COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT COMMITTEES 2013-14

UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Reviews college recommendations for awards of tenure, renewals of probation, and promotions to professor; reviews and approves college standards for promotion and tenure. This committee is mandated by the **Collective Agreement (15.9.4):**

> The University shall have a review committee to consider tenure and other matters specifically assigned to this committee in the Agreement. The University Review Committee shall be made up of nine tenured or continuing employees plus the Vice-President Academic and Provost who shall be chair. The nine employees shall be nominated to this committee by the Nominations Committee of Council and approved by Council with the length of their term specified so as to ensure a reasonable turnover of membership. Employees shall not be nominated for membership if they have served on the University Review Committee in the previous three years or if they have agreed to serve on a College review committee in that academic year. In addition to those members mentioned above, two nominees of the Association shall serve as observers on the University Review Committee with voice, but without vote.

Nominees

New members

Mark Carter	**Law**	**2017**
Alison Norlen	**Art and Art History**	**2017**
Priscilla Settee	**Native Studies**	**2017**

Continuing members

Rob Pywell	Physics & Engineering Physics	2015
Donna Rennie	Nursing	2015
Bob Tyler	Food and Bioproduct Sciences	2016
Cheryl Waldner	Large Animal Clinical Sciences	2016
Scott Walsworth	HR and Organizational Behaviour	2016
Barry Ziola	Pathology	2015
~~Dwight Newman~~	~~Law~~	~~2014~~
~~Roger Pierson~~	~~Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reprod. Sci.~~	~~2014~~
~~Oon-Doo Baik~~	~~Chemical and Biological Engineering~~	~~2014~~

Chair: Jim Germida, Vice-Provost, Faculty Relations

Secretary: Anna Okapiec, Assistant to the Vice-Provost, Faculty Relations

RENEWALS AND TENURE APPEAL PANEL

From this roster, the members are chosen for committees on Sabbatical Appeal, Promotion Appeal, and Tenure Appeal Committees, and for the President's Review Committee.

This panel is mandated by Collective Agreement (15.9.5.2):

> An Appeal Panel of forty-eight employees drawn from the membership of the General Academic Assembly shall be named by the Nominations Committee of Council and approved by Council, with length of term specified so as to ensure a reasonable turnover of membership. Additional members may be chosen, if necessary, to staff appeal committees. Membership shall be restricted to tenured faculty with past experience on tenure committees, who are not members of the University Review Committee and who have not served on the University Review Committee in the previous three years. The following criteria shall govern the selection of the Panel:
>
> a) The Nominations Committee of Council shall strive to achieve a gender balance based on the overall membership of the General Academic Assembly;

b) The Nominations Committee of Council shall strive to achieve representation from a wide range of disciplinary areas based on the faculty complement in each College.

Nominees

To June 30, 2017

Marie Battiste	**Educational Foundations**
Ken Belcher	**Bioresource Policy, Business and Economics**
Scott Bell	**Geography and Planning**
Beth Bilson	**Law**
Valery Chirkov	**Psychology**
Candice Dahl	**Library**
Glen Gillis	**Music**
Dean Kolbinson	**Dentistry**
Kent Kowalski	**Kinesiology**
Nicholas Low	**Food and Bioproduct Sciences**
Jeanette Lyons	**English**
Barb Phillips	**Management and Marketing**
Peter Phillips	**Public Policy**
Vivian Ramsden	**Family Medicine**
Dave Sanders	**Chemistry**
Anurag Saxena	**Medicine**
Verna St. Denis	**Educational Foundations**

Nominee to serve to June 30, 2016

Curtis Pozniak	**Crop Development Centre**

Continuing members

To June 30, 2016

Kevin Ansdell	Geological Sciences
Marilyn Baetz	Psychiatry
Shauna Berenbaum	Pharmacy and Nutrition
~~Ron Bolton~~	~~Electrical and Computer Engineering~~
Ron Cooley	English
Bruce Coulman	Plant Sciences
Maria Copete	Dentistry
~~Ralph Deters~~	~~Computer Science~~
Joanne Dillon	Biology
Amin Elshorbagy	Civil and Geological Engineering
Sherif Faried	Electrical and Computer Engineering
Jill Hobbs	Bioresource Policy, Business and Economics
Dianne Miller	Educational Foundations
Nazeem Muhajarine	Community Health and Epidemiology
~~David Mykota~~	~~Educational Psychology and Special Education~~
Mehdi Nemati	Chemical and Biological Engineering
Jeff Taylor	Pharmacy and Nutrition

to June 30, 2015

Sabina Banniza	Plant Sciences
James Brooke	Mathematics and Statistics
Fionna Buchanan	Animal and Poultry Science
Phil Chillibeck	Kinesiology
Gary Entwhistle	Accounting

Rob Flanagan	Law
Rob Hudson	Philosophy
Ramji Khandelwal	Biochemistry
Karen Lawson	Psychology
Cindy Peternelj-Taylor	Nursing
~~Brian Pratt~~	~~Geological Sciences~~
Bill Roesler	Biochemistry
Bing Si	Soil Science
Jaswant Singh	Veterinary Biomedical Sciences
Lisa Vargo	English
Fran Walley	Soil Science
Gordon Zello	Pharmacy and Nutrition

to June 30, 2014

~~Andy Allen~~	~~Veterinary Pathology~~
~~Daniel Beland~~	~~Public Policy~~
~~Angela Busch~~	~~Physical Therapy~~
~~Vicki Duncan~~	~~Library~~
~~Xulin Guo~~	~~Geography and Planning~~
~~Pam Haig Bartley~~	~~Drama~~
~~Judith Henderson~~	~~English~~
~~Mehran Hojati~~	~~Finance and Management Science~~
~~Lisa Kalynichuk~~	~~Psychology~~
~~Suren Kulshreshtha~~	~~Bioresource Policy, Business & Economics~~
~~Yen-Han Lin~~	~~Chemical and Biological Engineering~~
~~Phyllis Shand~~	~~Food and Bioproduct Sciences~~
~~Ray Stephanson~~	~~English~~
~~Susan Whiting~~	~~Pharmacy & Nutrition~~

OTHER COMMITTEES 2014-15

POLICY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Nominees

Richard Julien	**Religion and Culture**	**2017**
Bob Tyler	**Food and Bioproduct Sciences**	**2017**

To replace:

~~Chary Rangacharyulu~~	~~Physics & Engineering Physics~~	~~2014~~
~~Hans Michelmann~~	~~Political Studies~~	~~2015~~

RECREATION AND ATHLETICS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Recommends on the recreation and athletic fees charged to students and reviews reports on expenditures. Committee includes three faculty members (at least two of whom are not members of the College of Kinesiology). Members may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms.

Nominee from GAA

Steve Wormith	**Psychology**	**First term**	**2017**

Continuing members

Nancy Gyurcsik	Kinesiology	Second term	2016
Jim Merriam	Geological Sciences	First term	2015
~~Doug Degenstein~~	~~Physics & Engineering Physics~~	~~First term~~	~~2014~~

SENATE ROUND TABLE ON OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT

This is an initiative of the Foundational Document on Outreach and Engagement. It includes four faculty representatives:

Nominee (from GAA)

Margaret Kovach	**Educational Administration**	**2015**

Continuing members

~~Vicki Duncan~~	~~Library~~	~~2014~~
Grant Wood	Plant Sciences	2015
Phyllis Shand	Fod and Bioproduct Sciences	2016

AGENDA ITEM NO: 10.1

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

NOTICE OF MOTION

PRESENTED BY: Louise Racine, on behalf of Carol Rodgers
Governance Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: Bylaws Amendments

DECISION REQUESTED: *It is recommended:*

That Council approve the following amendments to Council Bylaws:

1. Addition of the following statement as Part One, III, 5 (k) "Unless the Council decides otherwise, the secretary of Council meetings shall be the University Secretary, or a member of the University Secretary's office as designated by the University Secretary."

2. Deletion of the following two sentences from Part Three, I, 2 – "Recipients of degrees other than honorary degrees shall be presented for admission by the dean of the faculty, or a designate, to which the degree belongs. Each recipient of an honorary degree shall be presented for admission by the President or by a person designated for that purpose by the President."

3. Housekeeping changes to correct cross-referencing in Part One, III, 5 (f) and (g), as shown on the attached pages 5 and 6 of Council Bylaws.

PURPOSE:

The proposed Bylaws amendments are indicated in the attached marked version of the Council Bylaws on pages 5, 6 and 26.

- The first amendment is to include the following statement in Part One, III, 5(k): *"Unless the Council decides otherwise, the secretary of Council meetings shall be the University Secretary, or a member of the University Secretary's office as designated by the University Secretary."*

  Section 55 of *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995* currently states: *Unless the council decides otherwise, the secretary is the secretary to the council.* (The definition of

"secretary" in the Act is the secretary appointed by the Board – which is the University Secretary.) The reasons for the inclusion of the revised statement are:

(i) there are times when the University Secretary has been unable to attend Council meetings due to sickness or absence for some other reason, and in those cases someone from the Office of the University Secretary has been asked to be the acting secretary; and

(ii) to enable the University Secretary to designate a member of the university secretariat to serve as secretary to Council to allow this office to have a division of responsibilities and focus. In this instance the designated secretary to Council would also serve as a resource person to the governance committee, coordinating committee, planning and priorities committee, nominations committee and administer Council elections. The proposed change is in keeping with the model found at many other universities in Canada, where there is one person who provides dedicated support as secretary to the academic governing body and another who is secretary to the board of governors, but both individuals are in the same office and often one reports to the other.

- The second amendment is to delete two sentences found in Part Three, I, 2 on page 26 of the Bylaws, to allow more flexibility in the presentation of recipients for degrees and honorary degrees. The university's current practice at Convocation does not align with the language in the Bylaws as we currently have orators present the recipients of degrees not deans, and the presentation of recipients for honorary degrees is by a person designated for that purpose by the University Secretary not the President. The two sentences recommended for deletion are: *"Recipients of degrees other than honorary degrees shall be presented for admission by the dean of the faculty, or a designate, to which the degree belongs. Each recipient of an honorary degree shall be presented for admission by the President or by a person designated for that purpose by the President."*

- The third amendment is to correct cross-referencing in Part One, III, 5, (f) and (g), as shown on the attached pages 5 and 6 of Council Bylaws.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Council Bylaws, proposed amendments shown in mark-up on pages 5, 6 and 26.

(i) That the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson will normally hold office for a period of 2 years unless removed by a vote of 2/3 of the members of the Council.

4. Council Membership

(a) Annual elections for Council will be completed by March 31.

(b) Term of office for Council membership begins July 1 of the year of the member's election or appointment.

(c) Terms of student members will be one year beginning July 1.

(d) When a person appointed to Council under Section 53 (2)(c)(ii) of the Act ceases to be a dean, the acting dean or a new dean appointed during the term of the incumbent dean will occupy the position of dean with voice and vote until the expiration of the incumbent dean's term on Council when a new election or appointment occurs.

(e) A vacancy occurs on Council when:

(i) a member resigns from Council or ceases to be an employee of the University, or

(ii) a member is unavailable to attend meetings of Council for a period of greater than six months during his or her term.

5. Council Meetings

(a) Council meetings will be open except when Council decides to have them closed.

(b) Council will meet monthly during the academic term (September - June). The Chairperson can call a meeting during the July to August period.

(c) Attendees at Council meetings are expected to refrain from unauthorized audio or video recording of the proceedings and to respect the rulings of the Chairperson.

(d) Special meetings of Council can be called by the Chairperson or by petition of 20% of the members of Council.

(e) A motion to amend the bylaws will be preceded by a notice of motion presented in writing to the members not less than 30 days prior to the date of the meeting at which the motion is considered.

(f) Except as provided in bylaws (~~d~~e) and (~~g~~h), a motion will be preceded by a notice of motion presented in writing to the members of Council not less than 10 days prior to the date of the meeting at which the motion is to be considered. This bylaw applies only to a motion dealing with a substantive matter which requires consideration by members of Council prior to the meeting at which the motion is presented. Whether or not a motion falls within this bylaw will be determined by the Chairperson.

(g) The requirement of bylaw (~~e~~f) may be suspended upon vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting at a meeting.

(h) A recommendation to Council contained in a committee report is deemed to be a notice of motion if the report containing the recommendation is included with the agenda of the meeting at which the report is considered.

(i) In the event of an emergency situation as declared jointly by the president and chair of Council or their respective delegates, if Council is unable to meet or attain quorum, Council may decide urgent matters by alternative means. Procedures governing such decisions are the responsibility of the Governance Committee.

(j) The meetings of the Council and of committees of Council will be conducted in accordance with the rules of order contained in *Procedures for Meetings and Organizations, Third Edition by Kerr and King.*

(k) Unless the Council decides otherwise, the secretary of Council meetings shall be the University Secretary, or a member of the University Secretary's office as designated by the University Secretary.

IV. THE COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL

1. Creation and Composition of Council Committees

(a) Council has the statutory power to establish committees to facilitate its work. There is no requirement that these committees be composed entirely of Council members.[2] Council is also empowered to appoint members of joint committees involving the Board, the Senate or the General Academic Assembly.

(b) The committees specified in Part Two of these bylaws are created as standing committees.

(c) The Governance Committee will nominate the members and chairperson of the Nominations Committee.

(d) The Nominations Committee will nominate members, including the chairpersons, of Council committees. Except where the chair is required to be a member of Council, the Nominations Committee shall first consider Council members for the position of Chair and if a suitable nominee cannot be obtained, then the Chair will be selected from the General Academic Assembly members.

(e) The Nominations Committee will present its nominations to the Council at the May meeting and otherwise as required when vacancies occur.

It is the responsibility of the Nominations Committee of Council to present a slate of candidates for all committee positions except the Nominations

[2] The only statutory restriction on the committee structure is prescribed by section 61(2) of the *Act* which requires that a committee established to discipline students or hear appeals with respect to student discipline must contain members of Council who are students.

Certificate in Agricultural Lifetime Leadership
This Land Certificate
Certificate in Human Resource Leadership Development

2. Degrees, Certificates and Diplomas may be conferred at the annual meeting of Convocation or at any other meeting of Convocation. The formal admission of candidates to degrees, certificates and diplomas shall, in the absence of the Chancellor, be made by the President (Vice-Chancellor), or by a member of the Council, appointed for that purpose. ~~Recipients of degrees other than honorary degrees shall be presented for admission by the dean of the faculty, or a designate, to which the degree belongs. Each recipient of an honorary degree shall be presented for admission by the President or by a person designated for that purpose by the President.~~

3. Degrees may be conferred upon persons in absentia.

II. CANCELLATION OF DEGREES

Council may revoke the Degree or Degrees, Diplomas, Certificates and Distinctions of the University and all privileges connected therewith of any holder of the same for cause or where the conduct of the holder, in the opinion of Council and following due process under the Academic Misconduct regulations, shall constitute a breach of any agreement made with the University as a condition of the conferment of such degree or degrees, diplomas, certificates or distinctions. Council may restore, on cause being shown, any person so deprived to the degree, distinction or privileges previously enjoyed by that person without further examination.

III. UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS

Under section 61(1) (d) of the Act, Council is authorized to grant scholarships, prizes, fellowships, bursaries and exhibitions. Under section 49 (1) (i) the Board of Governors provides for the establishment of scholarships, fellowships, bursaries and exhibitions if authorized by Council.

IV. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COLLEGES AND DIVISIONS

1. In the University the following Colleges and Schools shall be established, namely:
   (a) The College of Arts and Science
   (b) The College of Agriculture and Bioresources
   (c) The College of Law
   (d) The College of Engineering
   (e) The College of Pharmacy and Nutrition
   (f) The College of Education
   (g) The Edwards School of Business
   (h) The College of Graduate Studies and Research
   (i) The College of Medicine
   (j) The Western College of Veterinary Medicine
   (k) The College of Dentistry
   (l) The College of Kinesiology
   (m) The College of Nursing
   (n) The Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy
   (o) The School of Public Health
   (p) The School of Environment and Sustainability

AGENDA ITEM NO: 10.2

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

REQUEST FOR INPUT

PRESENTED BY: Louise Racine, on behalf of Carol Rodgers
Governance Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: **Amendment to *Procedures on Student Appeals in Academic Matters***

COUNCIL ACTION: For input only

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

The governance committee has identified the need to enable the university to modify a student's involvement in a practicum, clinical setting, or other work environment when the student has appealed a decision of academic assessment related to the student's work and interactions with others in these types of settings. The proposed change to the *Procedures for Student Appeals in Academic Matters* permits the student's activities to be discontinued or modified until the appeal can be heard when there is a concern about the safety or wellbeing of others in relation to the student.

A similar change will be recommended in relation to the university's *Academic Misconduct Regulations,* when the revised regulations are submitted to Council once ongoing revisions are complete.

Members of Council are invited to share their thoughts regarding the proposed procedures, and to consult with their colleagues and associates regarding the procedures. Comments may be submitted to Carol Rodgers, committee chair at carol.rodgers@usask.ca or to Elizabeth Williamson, university secretary at elizabeth.williamson@usask.ca. The committee's intent is to submit the revised procedures to Council for approval in June.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft revised *Procedures on Student Appeals in Academic Matters* (April 2014) – **see section B.1.2.c, pp 8 and 9.**

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

Procedures for Student Appeals in Academic Matters

Pursuant to the *Policy on Student Appeals of Evaluation, Grading and Academic Standing*

Approved by Council January 2012

Effective for appeals of decisions made on or after May 9, 2012

CONTENTS

Student Appeals in Academic Matters

I Scope of Procedures

II Availability of Written Work

III Substantive Academic Judgment of Student Work: Undergraduates (including postgraduate trainees and students in diploma programs and certificate programs under the oversight of Council)
- A. Instructor Level: Informal Consultation
- B. Formal Appeals for Re-assessment at the level of department or non-departmentalized college

IV Substantive Academic Judgment of Student Work: Graduate Students
- A. Instructor Level: Informal Consultation
- B. Formal Appeals for Re-assessment at the level of department or non-departmentalized college

V Appeals Dealing with Matters other than Substantive Academic Judgment

- A. College Level Appeals
  1. Appeals of Standing in Program
  2. Appeals of Assessment of Course Work

- B. University Level Appeals
  1. Grounds for an Appeal
  2. Initiation of the appeal
  3. Appointment of an Appeal Board
  4. Appeal Procedure
  5. Disposition by the Appeal Board
  6. Copy of a Report
  7. No Further Appeal
  8. Student Records

VI Rights and Responsibilities of Parties to a Hearing

VII Assistance with Appeals and Procedural Matters

Appendices:

Re-Assessment Form	Appeal at the level of Department or Non-departmentalized College: Request for and Report of Re-Assessment
University Appeal Form	University-Level Appeal of Matters Other than Substantive Academic Judgment

PROCEDURES FOR
STUDENT APPEALS IN ACADEMIC MATTERS

The following are approved by the University of Saskatchewan Council as regulations pursuant to Council's *Policy on Student Appeals of Evaluation, Grading and Academic Standing*.

I. SCOPE OF PROCEDURES AND DEFINITIONS

These procedures apply to the following decisions that affect the academic record and/or standing of a student registered or in attendance in a program under the oversight of Council:

(a) those involving an academic judgement, including (where relevant) assessment of a student's level of professionalism, on all course work, whether written (such as an examination paper, assignment, essay or laboratory report) or unwritten (such as performance in a verbal or artistic presentation, clinical or professional service activity or practicum), including deferred examinations, supplemental examinations, special examinations and other extraordinary methods of assessment;

(b) those pertaining to a student's academic standing in his or her program; and

(c) those pertaining to academic assessment to the extent that it has been affected by other than substantive academic judgment.

In these procedures,

- "appellant" refers to the student making the appeal;
- "course work" includes all of the components of a student's program that are assigned a grade or outcome including thesis, project, field, practicum and laboratory work;
- "department" and "college" refer to the administrative unit of the university which offers the course or other academic activity to which a grievance relates;
- "department head" and "dean" refer to the administrative heads of such units and "dean" includes the dean of a college or the executive director of a school;
- "instructor(s)" refers to the person(s) who was/were responsible for the assessment of student work or performance because she or he or they prepared and graded or arranged for the grading of written work or who otherwise provided the assessment of the work or performance to which the following procedures apply;
- "respondent" refers to the individual(s) responding to the appeal.

II. AVAILABILITY OF WRITTEN WORK

A student shall be permitted to see her or his examinations or other work, and where possible to be provided a copy of her or his work, in accordance with the practices of the department or college. A department or college is not required to provide the student with access where a special form of examination is used. In such cases, students in the course should be informed at the beginning of a course that copies of examinations or other forms of assessment are not available.

III. SUBSTANTIVE ACADEMIC JUDGEMENT OF STUDENT WORK: UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS[1]

A student who is dissatisfied with the assessment of her or his work or performance in any aspect of course work, including a midterm or final examination, shall follow the procedures set out below.

The University recognises that instructors may use alternative forms of evaluation either to meet specific circumstances of the student (e.g., oral examinations to accommodate students physically unable to write) or because of the nature of the course (e.g. performance in a verbal or artistic presentation, clinical or service activity or practica). The following procedures shall also apply (as much as possible) to such alternative forms of evaluation.

A. Instructor Level: Informal Consultation

Prior to initiating formal procedures as set out below, a student who has a concern with the evaluation of her or his work or performance shall consult wherever possible with the individual(s) that evaluated the work or performance. This informal consultation should take place as soon as possible, but in any event, not later than 30 days after the assessment has been made available to the students in the class.

The purpose of the informal consultation is

- To assist the student in understanding how his or her grade was arrived at;
- To afford an opportunity for the instructor(s) and student to review the evaluation and ensure that all work was included, that all material was marked, that no marks were left out and that additions and grade calculations were correctly made.

.

[1] Includes postgraduate trainees and students in diploma programs and certificate programs under the oversight of Council.

Any errors discovered during this review should result in an appropriate change in the grade awarded the work or performance and in the instructor's records for the course. If the consultation relates to a final grade in a course, the mark or grade in the course may be changed following the normal grade change procedures, subject to approval by the department head (or dean in a non-departmentalized college).

If the student is not satisfied with the academic judgement rendered with respect to the work or performance, he or she may request reconsideration of the assessment. The instructor(s) may decide to evaluate the work or performance or request that the student apply for a formal re-assessment as set out in these procedures.

If the instructor(s) responsible for evaluation is/are not available, the student should seek advice from the individual responsible for the course (this may be the course coordinator, department head or dean in a non-departmentalized college, or the executive director for continuing and distance education) about the best means of fulfilling the requirement for informal consultation. The individual consulted may advise the student to apply for a formal re-assessment as provided for under Section B.

The college or department responsible for the course may specify different time limits than those prescribed above, and may, at its discretion, waive compliance with the time limits.

B. Formal Re-assessment (Re-read) at the level of Department or Non-departmentalized college

A department-level re-assessment involves a re-evaluation of assessment of written or non-written work in the context of the expectations for that work, arranged for by the department head (or dean in a non-departmentalized college, or executive director for certificate programs offered through continuing and distance education). The re-assessor should have access to a description of the instructor's expectations for the work, and, where feasible, to samples of work submitted by other students in the course. Where possible, the re-assessor should assess the work without knowledge of the mark given by the instructor(s).

Examples of non-written work include marks given for class participation, performance in oral or artistic presentations, clinical or professional service activities and practicum based activities. Since such forms of work or performance often involve assessment based on observation of the student's performance by the instructor or, in the case of a practicum, by someone else, it is not always possible to apply with precision the re-reading procedures set out in this section. However, these procedures shall apply as much as possible to such assessments.

Student should be aware that a grade may be reduced as the result of a re-assessment.

Process to be followed:

(a) To initiate a re-assessment of written work, the student shall submit a completed *Request for and Report of Re-Assessment Form* to the department head or dean in a non-departmentalized college, or the executive director for certificate programs offered through continuing and distance education. The request must be made within 30 days of the delivery to the student of the results of the assessment under review. A fee specified by the registrar shall be tendered with the request. The fee will be refunded if the student's grade on the course or course component is increased at least five (5) percentage points as a result of the re-reading or if the student's grade is increased from a Fail to a Pass in a course or course component where the assessment is Pass/Fail.

The request shall state briefly the student's concern with the assessment of the work.

(b) The department head or dean in a non-departmentalized college, or the executive director for certificate programs offered through continuing and distance education, shall determine whether it is feasible to arrange to have some or all of the student's work or performance re-assessed by someone, other than the instructor(s), whom the department head, dean or executive director decides is qualified to do so. Where the department head or dean or executive director concludes that some or all of the performance or work can be re-assessed by someone other than the instructor who is qualified to do so, he or she shall appoint such person or persons for this purpose. The re-assessment may be done by the original examiner(s) when no such person is available.

Where possible, the marking or grading structure used by the instructor(s) shall be used by the re-reader. The mark or grade given by the re-assessor may be higher or lower than the mark given by the instructor(s). The result of the re-read shall be recorded on the *Request for and Report of Re-Assessment Form.*

(c) The original mark or grade shall not be changed until after the original instructor(s) has/have been consulted by the department head or dean or executive director. This requirement may be waived by the department head or dean or executive director when consultation is not practicable. A third reader may be appointed to resolve any disagreement between the instructor(s) and the re-reader as to the mark or grade to be assigned to the work. Otherwise, the department head, dean or executive director, or a committee appointed for such purpose, shall determine the mark or grade following the report of the results of the re-reading.

(d) The student shall be notified in writing by the department head or dean or executive director of the determination of the mark or grade as soon as possible, but not later than 30 days after the results of the re-assessment are determined as provided in (c).

(e) A ruling of a department-level decision on a matter of substantive academic judgement will be final.

(f) A student who believes that the assessment of his or her work or performance has been negatively affected by a factor not involving academic judgement of the substance of the work or performance may appeal as provided in Part V.

IV. SUBSTANTIVE ACADEMIC JUDGEMENT OF STUDENT WORK: GRADUATE STUDENTS

A. Instructor Level: Informal Consultation

A graduate student who is dissatisfied with the assessment of her or his work or performance in any aspect of course work shall first follow the informal procedures for consultation with the instructor(s) as set out in III.A, above.

B. Formal Appeals

Following informal consultation with the instructor (where feasible), a graduate student who has a concern or question about the evaluation of her or his work or performance should consult with the graduate chair of the program or the dean of graduate studies and research before invoking formal procedures. If, after these consultations, the student is unsatisfied, he or she may petition the graduate academic affairs committee of the College of Graduate Studies and Research for a formal ruling on the matter. If the concern relates to a written examination, essay or research paper, the student may request, or the committee may institute, a re-read procedure similar to that described above for undergraduate students. If the concern involves any other form of assessment, the committee shall consider and rule on it.

The ruling by the graduate academic affairs committee of the College of Graduate Studies and Research on a matter of substantive academic judgment will be final. This includes decisions on the acceptability of the thesis and the results of oral examinations.

A ruling on a concern that assessment of a graduate student's academic work or performance has been negatively affected by a factor not involving academic judgment of the substance of the work or performance may be appealed as hereinafter provided**.**

V. APPEALS DEALING WITH MATTERS OTHER THAN SUBSTANTIVE ACADEMIC JUDGMENT

A. COLLEGE LEVEL APPEAL

This section deals with matters not directly involving substantive academic judgment which, however, may affect a student's academic record, standing or status.

1. Appeals of Standing in Program

Council delegates to college and school faculty councils and in the case of certificates of successful completion offered through continuing and distance education, to the provost, the responsibility for developing and approving procedures by which a student may appeal decisions concerning his or her overall standing, including decisions around progression in the program, granting of leaves, probationary status and graduation, on compassionate, medical or other grounds. These decisions may be further delegated by the faculty council or the provost to a committee established for this purpose, or to a college dean, the executive director of a school, or an associate or assistant dean provided that there is a provision for reporting such decisions back to the faculty council. Such decisions are subject to university-level appeal on limited grounds as provided for in Section B, below.

2. Appeals of Assessment in Course Work

A student who alleges that assessment of her or his academic work or performance in course work has been negatively affected by a factor not involving academic judgment of the substance of the work or performance may appeal the assessment. Council delegates responsibility for investigating and, if the appeal is upheld, for determining an appropriate remedy, to the dean of the college responsible for the course or activity or to the provost for certificate programs offered through continuing and distance education as described below. The outcome of the appeal to the dean or provost is limited to a change in the student's grade in the course(s) under appeal, and is subject to university-level appeal as provided for in Section B below.

(a) The student shall deliver to the dean or provost, not later than 30 days from the date the student is informed of the assessment, a written statement of the allegation and a request for a review of the matter. The dean or provost may extend the period of time to submit the written statement.

(b) Subject to section (c) below, the dean or provost shall instruct the department head (if it is a departmentalized college) to arrange for an informal

investigation of the allegation. In a non-departmentalized college or the Centre for Continuing and Distance Education, the dean or provost respectively shall arrange for such an investigation. The investigation shall be carried out as expeditiously as possible and must include, wherever practical, consultation with the original instructor.

(c) In a case where a student's allegation involves the dean or department head or provost, that individual should declare a conflict of interest and assign the case to an associate or assistant dean or another member of the department who has not been involved in the assessment.

(d) The dean or provost (or delegate under section c) shall inform the student and the original instructor in writing as to the outcome of the investigation. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, he or she may initiate an appeal as provided in Section B below, subject to the grounds specified in that section.

B. UNIVERSITY LEVEL APPEAL

1. Grounds for an Appeal

(a) A student may appeal as hereinafter provided a decision affecting her or his academic standing on the following grounds only:

(i) alleged failure to follow procedural regulations of the relevant college or the university dealing with assessment of students' academic work or performance or administrative decisions or alleged misapplication of regulations governing program or degree requirements;

(ii) alleged differential treatment of the student as compared to the treatment of other students in the course or program, where the alleged differential treatment affected assessment of the student's academic work or performance;

(iii) alleged discrimination or harassment, as set out in the University's Policy on Discrimination and Harassment Prevention and procedures for addressing issues of discrimination and harassment, where the alleged violation affected assessment of the student's academic work or performance; or

(iv) alleged failure to implement the approved policy and procedures of the University dealing with accommodation of students with disabilities, when the alleged failure affected assessment of the student's academic work or performance.

(b) A student has no right of appeal under these rules with respect to an academic judgment of the written or non-written work, performance or activities or with respect to a decision relating to the provision of deferred or special examinations or other extraordinary methods of assessment unless that judgment or decision is alleged to involve or be affected by a factor mentioned in clause 1(a).

(c) A student has no right of appeal as hereinafter provided until all applicable steps set out in preceding rules have been taken and a final decision in relation to the matter has been made as provided in those rules. In particular, a university-level appeal hearing will not be held until a report of the college-level investigation as outlined in Section A has been rendered.

2. Initiation of the Appeal

(a) A student initiates an appeal under these rules by delivering a notice of university-level appeal to the following persons:

(i) the university secretary;

(ii) the dean of the college offering the course to which the allegation relates or, if it is a program offered through continuing and distance education, the provost;

(iii) the faculty member responsible for the course to which the allegation relates; and

(iv) the dean of the college in which the student is registered, if different from the dean in (ii) above ; and

(v) the registrar.

(b) The notice of appeal shall be delivered as soon as possible, but not later than 30 days from the date a final decision on the college-level appeal has been communicated in writing to the student. Thereafter no appeal may be brought.

(c) In general, any assessment of student work and/or standing is considered valid until and unless it has been successfully overturned by an appeal. Reasonable and appropriate efforts should be made, however, to maintain a student's standing while an appeal is pending, subject to such considerations as safety or wellbeing of others. If any assessment of student work and/or standing pertains to conduct that may significantly impact the safety or wellbeing of others, including without limitation patients, students or clients, the dean of the college responsible for the course or activity, or the provost, for those certificate programs approved by the provost, may modify the participation of the student in academic or

clinical settings or other work placements, pending final outcome of an appeal under these procedures.

3. Appointment of an Appeal Board

(a) Upon receipt of a notice of appeal, the university secretary shall constitute an appeal board to be composed of three members of Council, one of whom is a student. One faculty member of the appeal board shall be named chairperson. The members of the board shall be chosen from a roster nominated by the nominations committee of Council.

4. Appeal Procedure

(a) The appeal board shall convene to hear the appeal as soon as is practicable, but not later than 30 days after it is constituted or such later date as is acceptable to the student and the dean whose decision is being appealed. Under exceptional circumstances, the board may extend this period.

(b) Written notice of the hearing, along with a copy of these Procedures and of the written statement of appeal, will be delivered by the university secretary to the appellant, to the individual whose decision is being appealed as respondent, and to members of the appeal board. Where possible and reasonable the secretary will accommodate the schedules of all parties and will provide at least seven (7) days' notice of the time and location of the hearing. Where there are special circumstances (as determined by the secretary), the matter may be heard on less than seven (7) days' notice.

(c) If any party to these proceedings does not attend the hearing, the appeal board has the right to proceed with the hearing, and may accept the written statement of appeal and/or a written response in lieu of arguments made in person. An appellant who chooses to be absent from a hearing may appoint an advocate to present his/her case at the hearing.

(d) The appeal board is not bound to observe strict legal procedures or rules of evidence but shall establish its own procedures subject to the following provisions and to the principles outlined in Section VI, *Rights and Responsibilities of the Parties to a Hearing*:

(i) The student shall be entitled to be represented by one other person, including legal counsel;

(ii) The dean or designate shall respond to the allegation and may be represented by one other person, including legal counsel;

(iii) Evidence supporting or rebutting the allegation may be given by witnesses, including, in cases where the appeal relates to a course,

the instructor(s) responsible for the course(s) to which the allegation relates;

(iv) Witnesses may be questioned by a person mentioned in clauses (i) to (ii) or by the board;

(v) The appellant and the respondent(s) shall appear before the appeal board at the same time;

(vi) Both the appellant and the respondent(s) will have an opportunity to present their respective cases and to respond to questions from the other party and from members of the appeal board.

(vii) It shall be the responsibility of the appellant to demonstrate that the appeal has merit;

(viii) Hearings shall be restricted to persons who have a direct role in the hearing, except that either party may request the presence of up to three observers, not including witnesses. At the discretion of the chair, other persons may be admitted to the hearing for training purposes, or other reasonable considerations.

(ix) Appeal boards may at their discretion request further evidence or ask for additional witnesses, including asking the instructor to give evidence.

(x) The university secretary or a designate of the university secretary shall record the proceedings.

5. Disposition by the Appeal Board

The appeal board may, by majority:

(a) conclude that the allegation was unfounded and dismiss the appeal; or

(b) conclude that the allegation was justified and specify measures to be taken by the college, school, department division, registrar or faculty member involved to correct the injustice including, but not limited to, the following:

(i) re-evaluation of the student's work or performance in accordance with the applicable rules of the college or the University; or

(ii) assessment of the student's work or performance by an independent third party capable of doing so; or

(iii) a refund or re-assessment of tuition or other fees

(c) The chairperson of the appeal board shall prepare a report of the board's deliberations and its conclusions. The report shall be delivered to the university secretary.

6. Copy of a Report

(a) Within 15 days from the date the appeal board has completed its deliberations, the university secretary or designate shall deliver a copy of the chairperson's report to the student who initiated the appeal and to the persons mentioned in Rule V.B.2(a) (ii)-(v).

(b) Where the appeal board has determined that a college, school, department or division is to address or act upon a particular matter, the college, school, department or division shall, within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the chairperson's report, advise the university secretary of its compliance, or timetable for compliance, with the decision. If the college, school, department or division fails without cause to confirm its compliance, the governance committee will review the matter and, if appropriate, require the provost and vice-president academic to instruct the unit to comply.

7. No Further Appeal

The findings and ruling of the appeal board shall be final with no further appeal and shall be deemed to be findings and a ruling of Council.

8. Student Records

(a) Upon receipt of a notice of university-level appeal, the registrar shall endorse on the student's record as it relates to the academic work or performance alleged to have been affected the following statement: "This record is currently under appeal and may be affected by the decision of an appeal board." This endorsement shall be removed from the student's record upon receipt by the registrar of a copy of the decision of the appeal board.

(b) Upon receipt of notice of a re-evaluation or reassessment pursuant to the order of an appeal board, the registrar shall amend the student's record accordingly and shall expunge all indication of the record that has been replaced.

VI . RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES TO A HEARING

Hearings provide an opportunity for a balanced airing of the facts before an impartial board of decision-makers. All appeal hearings will respect the rights of members of the university community to fair treatment in accordance with the principles of natural justice. In particular,

(a) The parties have a right to a fair hearing before an impartial and unbiased decision-maker. This right includes the right for either party to challenge the suitability of any member of the hearing board based on a reasonable apprehension of bias against the complainant's or respondent's case. The hearing board will determine whether a reasonable apprehension of bias is warranted.

(b) Reasonable written notice will be provided for hearings, and hearings will be held and decisions rendered within a reasonable period of time. It is the responsibility of all parties to ensure that the University has current contact information for them. Any notice not received because of a failure to meet this requirement will have no bearing on the proceedings.

(c) All information provided to a hearing board in advance of a hearing by either party will be shared with both parties prior to the hearing.

(d) Neither party will communicate with the hearing board without the knowledge and presence of the other party. This right is deemed to have been waived by a party who fails to appear at a scheduled hearing.

(e) The appellant and the respondent have a right to bring or to send in his/her place an advocate (which may be a friend, advisor, or legal counsel) to a hearing, and to call witnesses, subject to the provisions below with respect to the rights of the hearing board. If possible, the names of any witnesses and/or advocates are to be provided to the secretary 7 days prior to the hearing so that the secretary may communicate the names to the appellant and respondent and to the hearing board

(f) Parties to these proceedings have a right to a reasonable level of privacy and confidentiality, subject to federal and provincial legislation on protection of privacy and freedom of information.

(g) The hearing board has a right to determine its own procedures subject to the provisions of these procedures, and to rule on all matters of process including the acceptability of the evidence before it and the acceptability of witnesses called by either party. The secretary shall communicate to the appellant and respondent, as appropriate, the basis for the decision of the hearing board not to admit any evidence or witnesses. Hearing boards may at their discretion request further evidence or ask for additional witnesses to be called, subject to the requirement that all of the information before the hearing board be made available to both parties.

VII. ASSISTANCE WITH APPEALS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Students should be informed of the opportunity to receive assistance with appeals. Various offices within the Student Enrolment Services Division including the Aboriginal Students' Centre, Disability Services for Students, and the International Student and Study Abroad Centre, as well as representatives from the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Association, are available to assist with appeals.

Questions concerning procedural matters relating to appeals under these rules should be directed to the university secretary.

First approved by University Council on November 18, 1999 with revisions noted December 3, 1999.
Revisions approved by University Council on September 21, 2000.
Minor revisions approved by University Council on January 25, 2001; March 21, 2002, September 19, 2002.
Major revisions approved by University Council on January 26, 2012.

Re-Assessment Form **UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN**

Request for and Report of Re-Assessment
(Appeal at the level of Department or Non-departmentalized College)

 *This application is to be completed **only after** informal consultation with the instructor(s) responsible for evaluation has taken place and the student remains unsatisfied with the results. The completed report of re-assessment should be returned to the department head or dean (non-departmentalized college), who will complete it and submit to the Registrar.*

 This application must be submitted along with the required fee (as set by the Registrar) to the department or non-departmentalized college offering the course which is the subject of the request, as soon as possible, but no later than 30 days after the results of the assessment under review have been provided to the student. If the grade in the course or course component is increased at least 5 percentage points, or from a Fail to a Pass, as a result of the re-reading, the fee will be refunded.
Students should be aware that a grade may be reduced as the result of a re-assessment.

APPLICATION FOR RE-ASSESSMENT	
Name:	**Student number:** **NSID:**
Address *(Street, City, Postal Code)*:	**Telephone**: **Email:**
Formal re-assessment requested in: *Course name/number*	*Section*:
Instructor(s):	
Formal re-assessment requested for *(check where applicable):*	
❑ Final examination	*Date Written*
❑ Midterm examination	*Date Written*
❑ Essay	*Due Date*
❑ Term Work	*Due Date*
❑ Laboratory	*Due Date*
❑ Other (*specify*)	
❑ **Date of informal consultation with the instructor(s) _____ OR** ❑ **I was not able to consult with the instructor(s) (provide reason)**	
Specific nature of the complaint (*The student must specify precisely the nature of the complaint, failing which this form may be returned for more information. Use the reverse of sheet if additional space is required*):	
Date:	**Signature of student**:
REPORT OF RE-ASSESSMENT. (The re-assessor should not be aware of the original mark)	
Re-assessor's Mark ( )	**Comments :** (attach separate sheet)
Date:	**Signature of Re-Assessor**:
To be completed by department head once the report from the re-assessor is received.	

Results: Original Mark ( )	❑ *Change to*: ( )	❑ *No Change*
Final Grade ( )	❑ *Change to*: ( )	❑ *No Change*

Signature of dean, department head or executive director:
Submit to Registrar when completed.

University-Level Appeal of Matters
Other than Substantive Academic Judgement

- *This form must be delivered as soon as possible, but **not later than thirty (30) days** from the date the outcome of a college-level appeal has been communicated in writing to the student.*
- *A written statement outlining the allegation must be attached to this form; additional supplementary written information may also be attached.*

Name:	**Student Number:** **NSID**:
Address *(Street, City, Postal Code)*:	**Telephone**: **Email:**

Appeal related to (*check where applicable*):

- ❑ Faculty action/Standing in Program (*Program, year of program*):
- ❑ Course work/course grade
  (*Course name/number/section*):
  (*Instructor(s) responsible for the course*):
- ❑ Other (*please specify*):

Date final college-level decision communicated in writing:

Grounds for appeal (*check where applicable*):

- ❑ failure to follow procedural regulations of the relevant college or University dealing with assessment of students' academic work or performance or administrative decisions and the application of regulations governing program or degree requirements.
- ❑ differential treatment compared to other students in the course or program, where the alleged differential treatment affected assessment of the student's academic work or performance.
- ❑ alleged discrimination or harassment as set out in the university's Policy on Discrimination and Harassment Prevention and associated procedures, where the alleged discrimination or harassment affected assessment of the student's academic work or performance.
- ❑ failure to implement the approved policy and procedures of the University concerning accommodation of students with disabilities, where the alleged failure affected assessment of the student's academic work or performance.

Supplementary written information attached: ❑ Yes ❑ No

Date:	**Signature of Student**:

***Instructions**: To initiate an appeal, a student must deliver this form (with any supplementary written information attached) to **all** of the following: the **university secretary,** the **dean** of the college responsible for the course (if a specific course is involved), the **instructor(s)** responsible for the course (if a specific course is involved), the **dean** of the college in which the student is registered, and the **registrar**.*

Office of the University Secretary

212 Peter MacKinnon Building

University of Saskatchewan

107 Administration Place

Saskatoon, SK S7N 5A2

(306) 966-4632

email to *university.secretary@usask.ca*

policies and forms are available at:

http://www.usask.ca/secretariat/student-conduct-appeals/index.php

AGENDA ITEM NO: 10.3

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

REQUEST FOR DECISION

PRESENTED BY: Louise Racine, on behalf of Carol Rodgers
Governance Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: **Request for Decision: Nominations to the Nominations Committee**

DECISION REQUESTED: *It is recommended:*
That Council approve the nominations to the Nominations Committee effective July 1, 2014 as attached, and Ed Krol as Chair of the Nominations Committee for a one year term effective July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.

PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE FOR 2014/15

Name	College/Department	Term Expiring
Dwayne Brenna	Drama, Arts and Science	2016
~~Signa Daum Shanks~~	~~Law~~	~~2015~~
Nancy Gyurcsik	**Kinesiology**	**2017**
Ed Krol (Chair)	Pharmacy & Nutrition	~~2014~~ **2017**
Tamara Larre	**Law**	**2017**
Yen-Han Lin	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2015
~~Michael McGregor~~	~~Psychology, Arts and Science.~~	~~2014~~
Bram Noble	**Geography, Arts and Science**	**2017**
~~Curtis Pozniak~~	~~Plant Sciences, Agriculture and Bioresources~~	~~2015~~
~~Michele Prytula~~	~~Educational Administration~~	~~2014~~
~~Keith Walker~~	~~Educational Administration~~	~~2014~~
Bob Tyler	**Agriculture and Bioresources**	**2015**
Andrew Van Kessel	**Geography, Arts and Science**	**2017**
Terry Wotherspoon	Sociology, Arts and Science	2016

Ex Officio (non-voting)

Ilene Busch-Vishniac	President
Jay Kalra	Council Chair

AGENDA ITEM NO: 11.1

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

PRESENTED BY: Fran Walley, Chair, Planning and Priorities Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: **Report on TransformUS Action Plan**

COUNCIL ACTION: For information only

CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND:

The TransformUS Action Plan is submitted to Council in recognition of the planning and priorities committee's mandate for university-wide strategic planning. Discussion of the Action Plan will be invited at the Council meeting.

The committee reviewed a draft version of the Action Plan at its meeting on April 23, 2014, and provided suggestions and comments on the draft plan. In response, the plan was modified as deemed appropriate by PCIP and on April 30, 2014, the committee received the final Action Plan.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

The report is presented for information with no accompanying detailed analysis from the planning and priorities committee, as the Action Plan was received and discussed but no recommendations were made with respect to substantive changes, and the accompanying project briefs and summary were not reviewed by the committee prior to release. The committee's comments centred upon areas for clarification within the Action Plan, Council's jurisdictional authority, the need for consultation, and enhancing student accessibility and understanding of the plan.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. TransformUS Action Plan

   The project briefs and summary can be found at:
   http://words.usask.ca/transformus/actionplan/

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

TransformUS action plan: Our path toward financial sustainability

April 30, 2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of President Busch-Vishniac, the provost's committee on integrated planning (PCIP) was given the task of developing an action plan in response to the recommendations of the academic program and support services transformation task force reports which were released to the campus community in early December 2013. This document is the action plan.

Following a review of the principles and criteria used by PCIP, this action plan describes a set of university-wide projects organized into four themes:

1) **Simplify and amalgamate academic and administrative structures.** This theme is about increasing the impact of programs and key campus services by combining related programming, consolidating fragmented services, reducing administrative layers and amalgamating structures to better support student learning, faculty research and needed administrative functions.
2) **Focus on core mission.** Actions included under this theme are intended to focus institutional energy on degree-credit teaching and peer-reviewed research.
3) **Share services: work together across unit boundaries.** This multi-functional university-wide initiative is intended to improve the university's support services by reducing duplicate, fragmented and competitive administrative services and reorganizing them into new structures that will include local (decentralized), regional, and centralized provision of services.
4) **Incorporate prioritization into ongoing practice.** This theme focuses on the linkages between planning, budgeting and resource allocation, as well as outcomes assessment.

TransformUS is the University of Saskatchewan's adaptation of program prioritization. It was initiated in January 2013 with the objective of finding $20-25 million in permanent savings, with up to $5 million for reinvestment in priority areas. TransformUS is part of the larger operating budget adjustments (OBA) initiative, which was affirmed by the Board of Governors in May 2012 as a direct response to the projected deficit of $44.5 million by 2016 if no actions were taken.

To be financially sustainable, this action plan asserts that the University of Saskatchewan must reduce costs now; must limit cost growth in the future; must increase focus; and must ensure that human and financial resources are sufficiently concentrated behind strong and critical programs that are essential to the core missions of learning and discovery. The actions described in this plan will help the university accomplish these goals. And, while TransformUS actions are driven by financial necessities, they are also about nurturing and reinforcing academic strengths. Together with several other strategies included in the OBA initiative, the actions proposed in this plan will ensure that the University of Saskatchewan is among the most resilient, adaptable and focused universities of the next generation.

INTRODUCTION

This action plan is the provost's committee on integrated planning (PCIP)'s response to the recommendations of the academic program and support services transformation task force reports that were released to the campus community in early December 2013.

This action plan identifies a set of initiatives to be taken to address the $20-25 million target set by President Busch-Vishniac for TransformUS, the university's adaptation of program prioritization, and the items that will be brought forward for consideration/approval by the university's governing bodies and/or referred to unit leaders for action.

The set of co-ordinated measures outlined in this action plan is part of a larger initiative, operating budget adjustments (OBA), which was affirmed by the Board of Governors in May 2012 as a direct response to the projected deficit of $44.5 million by 2016 in the multi-year budget framework, if no actions were taken. Given that this plan addresses the president's directive of finding $20-$25 million in savings and up to $5 million for reinvestment in priority areas, completing the actions outlined in this plan will bring the total annual expense reductions achieved to date in the larger OBA initiative to an estimated $35 million. This plan therefore significantly assists the university in reaching its overall goal of financial sustainability, that is, a future in which expenditures no longer grow faster than revenues, and in which the likelihood of undertaking significant budget reductions is significantly diminished. In doing this we will be focusing the university's resources more tightly on supporting student learning, faculty research, and the resulting positive impacts in communities we serve.

Change is never easy for large organizations and especially for universities. Over the course of the past 18 months, our university has experienced significant change and all of the dynamics that go along with it: fear and uncertainty about jobs and job loss, anxiety and worry about the nature of the work to be performed, concern and stress about the availability of programs of study, alarm about continued existence of areas and disciplines of inquiry, anxiety about future structures and goals, doubt and disbelief about budgetary projections and financial management, and criticism and complaint about the process. As this plan has been developed, PCIP has strived to provide information through timely communications, blog posts, and regularly scheduled and special meetings to minimize rumours and speculations that have been circulating. We know this plan will not eliminate all of these tensions, but by setting a clear direction it will move us forward.

This plan presents an overview of what the university needs to do in the coming months and over the next year or two to address the recommendations in the task force reports, and to meet the challenge of the Board of Governors to leave "no stone unturned" in our efforts to ensure financial sustainability. As we outline the work ahead, PCIP strongly affirms that members of our campus community cannot lose sight of our goal: to be recognized among the most distinguished research-intensive universities in North America and world leading in selected areas of education and research. This goal is important to our key stakeholders,

students and the communities we serve. Achieving this goal will require our collective energy, co-ordinated and focused on a set of actions, and the courage and determination to see actions through to completion. Because this action plan below is about creating anew with greater efficiency and effectiveness, the collective engagement and concerted action of the whole university, including faculty, staff, students, deans, associate vice-presidents, executive directors and governing bodies is required for our goal to be fully realized and implemented.

Finally, and most importantly, this action plan has been developed by PCIP in an iterative and collaborative way through detailed discussions with senior leaders (deans, executive directors, associate-vice presidents and vice-provosts), taking into account feedback from the campus community and conversations with University Council and its committees, student leaders, department heads and the Board of Governors. We would like to thank the academic program and support services transformation task force members, the Senior Leadership Forum, the administrative leadership council, deans' council, the planning and priorities committee of University Council and other council committees, department heads, the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union and graduate student association executives, and all the alumni, donors, faculty, students and staff who make up the University of Saskatchewan campus community, for their comments and contributions to TransformUS over the past year and a half. As the changes outlined in this action plan are shaped and enacted, PCIP will continue to rely on your leadership, commitment, support and feedback.

PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA

This action plan is based on criteria and principles that were developed in consultation with the campus community in January 2014 and posted on the TransformUS website in February 2014.

To recap, the principles used by the provost's committee to support process management were: transparency and accountability, evidence informed, collaborative. The evaluation criteria utilized were: institutional benefit/transformational, alignment with strategic directions, financial sustainability, materiality, build organizational capacity, coherence.

Principles for process management:

- Transparency and accountability
- Evidence informed
- Collaborative

Evaluation criteria:

- Institutional benefit/ transformational
- Alignment with strategic directions
- Financial sustainability
- Materiality
- Build organizational capacity
- Coherence

Like the task forces, our experience was principled and criteria based. PCIP looked to be consistent with *Promise and Potential*, the university's third integrated plan, the foundational documents that are key elements of our planning process and with our university's new vision and mission. We also aimed high by setting a goal of financial sustainability—to have a transformative impact on university structures, processes, and culture so we do not

face similar budget adjustments every five to seven years. And, we looked to embed the idea of prioritization within our planning processes to more directly and more firmly link planning, budgeting and resource allocation, and outcomes assessment.

We rarely diverged from the thinking of the task forces, but our focus was different.

First, while the task forces reviewed programs, our job was to focus on actions, and, generally speaking, the units of action in our university are planning units—colleges, schools and major administrative units. We were therefore particularly interested in how task force recommendations rolled up at the college, school or unit level, and in what deans, executive directors and unit leaders thought about the relative prioritization of different activity areas and the patterns or groupings in the recommendations.

Second, our focus was centered on the estimated magnitude and impact on university revenues and expenditures. To identify university-level projects, particular attention was paid to the materiality criterion to ensure the university can obtain the savings it needs to address the projected deficit, thereby attending to the board's directive to leave "no stone unturned." As we conducted our work, we looked at all possible actions of significant scale to meet the board's financial goals. Smaller possible actions were left for college, school and unit leaders to evaluate later or separately.

Third, and equally important to materiality of savings, was our overall goal to ensure that university programs and services would be sustainable into the future. For example, PCIP kept front of mind the impact of the faculty incentive plan for retirement on possible initiatives that might be proposed. While this initiative cannot be viewed in itself as strategic (since it was based on the unco-ordinated departure of about seven per cent of faculty), we could and did consider how the pattern of recommendations of the academic task force related to participation in the retirement incentive program. Our proposals for structural reorganizations and plans for targeted budget cuts were shaped with the pattern of faculty retirements in mind. This process will be completed when TransformUS investments are made beginning mainly in 2015/16, which, we anticipate, will involve creation of faculty positions guided by TransformUS task force categorizations, transparent activity-based budget system (TABBS) results for units, support for transformative change and strategic priorities.

TransformUS is not only about short-term cost reduction. It is also about avoiding future costs and about ensuring the ongoing, effective use of our resources.

Fourth, and finally, over the many sessions and meetings as this action plan was developed, PCIP was consistently focused on having a bias toward action; seeking to advance the university decisively rather than through small, incremental steps. We will honour the effort and attention that our whole campus has put into TransformUS by ensuring that changes are significant and lasting. The goal must be to

achieve a sustainable state in which the university does not have to repeat the same process again in a couple of years. After a focused period of changes, we believe prioritization will become a mindset that continuously guides resource allocation from year to year into the future.

As we set out this action plan, it is important to understand that TransformUS is not only about short-term cost reduction. It is also about avoiding future costs and about ensuring the ongoing, effective use of our resources. Some actions that are identified in this plan could be seen to be saving little, but streamlining and simplifying much, with long-term benefits to clarity and effectiveness. And, some actions that are proposed will be very costly to introduce in the short-term, but will significantly reduce future costs. Long-term effectiveness and permanent cost containment are key considerations. The projects proposed in this plan are a balanced, co-ordinated, interconnected and mutually reinforcing set of ideas. All of the proposed actions are needed, we believe, in order to both achieve financial targets and to affect enduring change.

ACTION PLAN

While the task force reports provided the starting point for conversations with unit leaders from which the projects presented in this plan were developed and refined, it quickly became apparent that they could be grouped into four main themes. These themes characterize a university that will have simpler structures, tighter focus on its mission, staff working together in shared services and prioritization as an ongoing way of allocating resources. PCIP is hopeful the campus community sees the opportunity within this action plan, and that the campus will seize this occasion to simplify, to focus, to work together and to prioritize for our collective success.

Theme one: Simplify and amalgamate structures

Estimated cost savings of $11.8 million

This section of the action plan presents ten projects whose purpose is to combine and reduce university offices, unit structures, and programs. The goal of this set of actions is to maintain wide areas of institutional activity, including student learning, faculty research, and services to students and faculty, while simplifying the structures that support those activities. The following paragraphs describe the set of projects in general, followed by each of them presented in turn.

Projects that revolve around the simplification and amalgamation of structures are necessary because, over the years, the university has accepted an accumulation of offices, programs and units, each of which made sense individually, but which have given us a multiplicity of structures that may not be optimal. While many different areas of inquiry and many different

services make up a university and will continue to do so, the idea that all need their own separate organizational units or separate formal frameworks is a hindrance to our university's success. Excess structure divides our efforts and adds cost. The academic task force questioned the range of programs[i] of some academic units, the number of programs with low graduation rates[ii] or long completion times and the degree of competition between similar programs across the university. The academic task force also suggested that many programs, particularly undergraduate programs in related areas, seemed to compete for a similar student constituency and could be linked more closely together. Similarly, the support services task force shone a light on the organic growth[iii] of administrative staff, administrative structures and on administrative practices that transfer operating budget funding between units, thereby encouraging cost recovery[iv] operations to proliferate. As the support service task force report represents the first comprehensive and holistic look at our administrative and support service activities in many decades (if ever), PCIP was especially interested in its observations and conclusions. Both task forces pointed to a number of instances of duplication, fragmentation, overlap or undue complication. A conclusion to be drawn is that our university seems to be over-structured and over-subdivided for a university of our size, and we are overly burdened with costs and hindered from working together as effectively as we could be. In an era where resources are constrained and will remain so well into the future, we can no longer afford work-arounds. We need to take advantage of collaborative opportunities and synergies to be truly successful.

…intended to streamline, combine and reduce the number of structures that are parallel, duplicated and competitive to ensure efficiency and effectiveness, increase profile and impact, and provide more direct support to our university's academic priorities.

The need for simplification and streamlining begins with the top-level organizational structure and senior administrative leadership of the university, and a project in this area is presented first below. The thought process is centered on supporting needed work in the future with fewer separate offices, and reducing the overall size of the university's leadership group. Similar thought processes of amalgamating and combining can also be applied in various academic and administrative units across campus, where, after accommodating the impact of the incentive retirement plan for faculty, some cost reductions can still be identified as a result of new combinations of programs and activities. Further, the reconceptualization of programs into interdisciplinary and cross-college/school collaborations offers an opportunity not just for efficiency, but also for greater impact through new or revitalized programs that are attractive to students from within Saskatchewan and beyond. Through TransformUS, the university and its faculty, staff and students are presented with a real opportunity to re-imagine the structures that support our core missions of learning and discovery.

Projects identified as part of this theme are intended to streamline, combine and reduce the number of structures that are parallel, duplicated or competitive to ensure efficiency and

effectiveness, increase profile and impact, and provide more direct support to our university's academic priorities. These projects follow the principle that the simplest possible structure should sustain academic or support functions. By doing this, resources should be made available, now and in the future, to focus on high-impact and high-profile programs/services. Ongoing costs will be reduced and "work-arounds" will be removed. The principle of subsidiarity (assigning authority to the lowest level competent to exercise it), will empower action at the local level. Changing structures and amalgamating programs and services will be difficult because the university is an interconnected organism. A great deal of input and discussion will be needed to shape the changes and determine the best way of making them. Nevertheless, making these changes will be critical to ensure the university's future financial sustainability.

- **Reduce and restructure senior leadership.** This set of projects involves changes to direct reports to vice-presidents, changes within vice-presidential portfolio offices and changes within central administrative offices, including reductions in numbers of directors, increases in spans of control and changes to titles. A first phase will reduce top levels of leadership by approximately 23 per cent. Given that the University of Saskatchewan is one of the smallest members of the U15, it should follow that we have one of the smallest senior administrations. A significant reorganization within the senior leadership, through TransformUS, will produce this result. The number of leadership positions reporting to the four vice-presidents will be reduced, including at the associate vice-president, dean, executive director and director levels. Included in these changes, proposals will be made to reduce the number of deans by three through reporting changes and structural changes. A second phase will remove levels of management within portfolios to provide improved front-line services. Included in this will be a number of separate projects involving significant reorganizations for each of the vice-presidential portfolios, to teaching and learning, and to college/school reporting arrangements.

  …the university will have one of the smallest senior administrations among our U15 peers…

  As PCIP reviewed the recommendations of the support service transformation task force (SSTF), we understood that the task force chose to consider various executive offices and their functions as separate programs, and recommended that various ones be considered as candidates for phase out, subject to further review (quintile 5 (Q5)).

  As this plan was developed, each TransformUS task force recommendation was examined carefully to consider not only the letter of the recommendation, but also its spirit as indicated by the themes identified by the task forces in their executive summaries, and the qualitative comments about each unit's programs. With this in mind, each senior leadership office in Q5, as well as others, was considered as a candidate for phase out. The overall organizational structure of our university was reviewed, the vice-presidential

portfolios in particular, as well as the organizational structures of other universities, in order to see which leadership positions could be eliminated or where streamlining through restructuring could bring about more efficient integration of activities. The provost's committee did so from the perspective that, in a university shrinking its resources by five per cent, leadership positions should also decrease in number by at least this amount. It seemed to us that, within this new context, all positions and organizational structures required examination.

There were a number of instances in which leadership offices were placed in Q5 while the functions they led were placed in higher quintiles. PCIP took this to mean that the leadership office in question should be carefully scrutinized, and, in particular, that we should consider whether it could be merged with another leadership role and/or changed to report at a different level in the organization and/or reconfigured.

…each TransformUS task force recommendation was examined carefully to consider not only the letter of the recommendation, but also its spirit as indicated by the themes identified by the task forces…

- In the case of the associate vice-president development, it was determined that, as part of a wider reorganization, the leadership office could be eliminated for a net reduction in leadership positions and a significant permanent saving. Former responsibilities of this position will be discontinued or redistributed among various remaining offices.
- In the case of the associate vice-president student affairs, it was determined that, as part of a general reorganization, this leadership office could be combined with another for a net reduction in leadership positions and a significant permanent saving. The combined new leadership area will be reorganized to ensure sustainability under a single leader.
- In the case of the dean of dentistry and the executive director of the School of Public Health, and a number of directors that previously reported to a vice-president directly, it was determined that these positions could report elsewhere in the organization, although, at the time of writing, the exact reporting structure for some of these positions is still not determined. Some savings can be anticipated, and a main benefit of this change lies in the streamlining of senior leadership.

The second phase of this project, to be completed by December 31, 2014, will reduce the number of managers, supervisors and levels between senior administration and the faculty and students that make up this university. The reduction in size of senior leadership and in layers of administrative functions will make it more important than ever that staff and managers at all levels be empowered to act within university policies and frameworks, and to resist the tendency to think of leadership or influence as something that can come only with a certain job title. More leadership will be delegated, and all supervisory positions will

have more responsibility to align with university directions and to take initiative to provide excellent service to students, faculty and staff.

As this work is carried out, it will be important to be vigilant to ensure that the gains made in span of control, titles and position levels are not eroded by the normal flow of routine processes. As a partial assurance against this, a new process that reviews all administrative and support job postings has been put in place in recent months. It is our intention to make institutional oversight for co-ordination and a broader perspective a normal practice of university operations throughout this planning cycle, culminating in guidelines for hiring of staff positions to be developed by Human Resources for institution-wide guidance and direction. Consideration must be given to additional staff positions and the value these create, based on institutional priorities and within the context of our core missions of learning and discovery. New staff positions being created in the university can be viewed on a website updated weekly at jobs.usask.ca.

Project briefs are under development for a number of sub-projects under this area; sub-project titles are provided below.

- Restructure provost and vice-president academic portfolio
- Restructure vice-president research portfolio
- Restructure vice-president advancement and community engagement portfolio
- Restructure vice-president finance and resources portfolio

- **Reorganize central services for teaching, learning and the student experience.** This set of interlinked projects involves changes to models for oversight of graduate education, redesign of support services for undergraduate and graduate students, and changes to academic and administrative structures that are intended to streamline and simplify in support of the new vision for the portfolio of the vice-provost teaching and learning (VPTL). A series of complex changes are envisioned, including proposals to disestablish the College of Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR) and to transfer leadership authority for the student related functions within the University Learning Centre to the University Library, while retaining the functions and reporting structure for the Gwenna Moss Centre for Teaching Effectiveness within the VPTL portfolio. Changes to learning technologies through consolidation of roles in Information and Communications Technology and Education and Media Access and Production (eMAP), and focus on core missions will result in the dissolution of eMAP as a support unit by December 31, 2014. A project to conceptualize an enterprise-wide timetabling and scheduling system aimed at addressing the needs of 21st century learners is also envisioned to provide the best possible schedule for students with a view to improving retention and optimizing university resources used to serve students.

In setting out these projects, PCIP is signaling that the student experience is a very high priority for action…

In setting out these projects, PCIP is signaling that the student experience is a very high priority for action as signaled by the SSTF and the functions that support students need to be organized in ways that optimize supports for student success. PCIP is also signaling that significant involvement by faculty, staff and students will be required for these projects to be successfully implemented.

Given the placement of functions for graduate education by both task forces, in addition to the outcomes of the graduate education review committee, it is clear that fundamental change is required in how our university structures and supports graduate education. A proposal for the disestablishment of CGSR will be prepared over the next few months and brought forward for consideration by University Council by fall 2014. At this time, the establishment of an office of graduate education within the VPTL portfolio is envisioned that will retain oversight of graduate policies, act as the home for graduate program review and provide support for post-doctoral fellows, among other duties to be described in the concept paper to be developed with participation of faculty, graduate students and staff. For this project and for others that require approval by one or more governing bodies, faculty, staff and students will be involved throughout the process, including drafting the concept paper, envisioning the future support structure and championing the outcomes.

The new portfolio of the VPTL will integrate teaching, learning and the student experience, including services delivered to both undergraduate and graduate students. The provost's committee envisions changes and streamlining within the Student Enrolment and Services Division (SESD) as part of an amalgamation with graduate student administrative support functions. Of primary importance is the co-ordination of services that span the student life cycle alongside the integration of faculty development and support for teaching both on campus and through distributed modalities. Changes to the organization of learning technologies will more effectively support classroom and student lab technology including computer, network and audio-visual systems, thereby optimizing use of learning technologies to enhance the student learning experience. Given the significant impact of the changes in this area on undergraduate and graduate students, PCIP commits to working with our students, either through their student organizations or in other meaningful and timely ways, so that these changes can directly benefit from student input and advice.

Project briefs are under development for a number of sub-projects. Titles are:

- Develop a new model for oversight of graduate education at the University of Saskatchewan
- Redesign services to support the undergraduate and graduate student experience
- Reorganize the University Learning Centre
- Reorganize learning technologies
- Redesign timetabling

- **Reorganize health science administrative structures.** A new configuration for health-sciences programming, involving**,** streamlining of structures and programs, reductions to the number of dean and equivalent positions reporting to the provost and reconceptualization of the current council of health science deans, is intended to provide more effective leadership for academic programming and research initiatives and achieve increased profile and impact. Changes envisioned include a new mandate and governance for the health sciences council, greater development of interprofessional education and interdisciplinary research across the health sciences, changes in reporting arrangements for the College of Dentistry and the School of Public Health, and increased linkages to programming in preventive and public health to achieve greater synergies, such as through amalgamation of public health and related programs. An investigation into alternative forms of organization for kinesiology academic programming and services is being considered given the reorganization of the health science programs and the size and scale of the college.

  For the project associated with optimizing public health programming and infrastructure, PCIP is looking to combine the relevant strengths of the School of Public Health and the Department of Community Health and Epidemiology in the College of Medicine, in order to create a strong nucleus for public-health research and educational programming. Apart from generally increased effectiveness and simplified university structures, a specific goal in this work is to create a larger and more robust unit that can support the original goals outlined when the School of Public Health was created in 2007, namely to augment university-wide research and graduate programming in the interdisciplinary field of public health. Ideally the merged entity will be clustered together with other centres, schools and units in which there is active interest in public health. Like all health sciences units, it will need to collaborate interprofessionally across the health sciences and be integrated in the health sciences council. Faculty across the university, including those associated with the One Health initiative, the Canadian Centre for Health and Safety in Agriculture, and the Saskatchewan Population Health and Evaluation Research Unit, will be invited to imagine and articulate ideas for cross-university programming.

  Project briefs are under development for a number of sub-projects under this area; sub-project titles are:

  - Establish and implement a new mandate for the Council of Health Science Deans
  - Optimize public health programming and infrastructure
  - Reconfigure dentistry
  - Investigate governance structures for kinesiology programs and services

- **Reconfigure campus libraries.** This project will continue the work initiated as the University Library Transformation Project by consolidating the library's collection and service footprint, and by implementing a new configuration for library resources and

services to optimize service delivery. It will involve the introduction of remote storage and retrieval systems, and changes to program service delivery. The purpose is to generate savings, deliver library service more efficiently and effectively, and free up valuable space within the core of campus for use by other university high-priority programs and services.

- **Reduce and restructure facilities management.** A direct response to the recommendations of the support services task force, this project is intended to continue the transformation undertaken beginning in summer 2013 by assessing and adjusting Facilities Management Division's functions and organizational structure. The purpose is to further streamline activities to ensure delivery of effective customer service and to achieve significant savings.

- **Reorganize and simplify related cross-college programming.** For a number of programs, the combination of recommendations by the task forces and the pattern of faculty retirements opened the possibility of reconceptualizing programs to increase impact and profile. The set of projects envisioned here address areas of related programming that straddle two or more colleges/schools, and where there are opportunities to combine resources to create much stronger programs. While some savings can be achieved, the most important purpose is to create sustainable programs and units that will have greater profile and impact, serving to distinguish the University of Saskatchewan and to attract wider student, faculty and public interest. Program areas include:

  - business policy and applied economics
  - environmental studies
  - food and nutrition

  While some savings can be achieved, the most important purpose is to create sustainable programs and units that will have greater profile and impact…

  Faculty within related units from across the campus will be asked to come together to champion academic change in these areas beginning with re-imagining undergraduate and graduate programming in new ways or combinations so that desired profile and impact are achieved.

- **Reorganize programs and department structures within selected colleges.** In a number of departmentalized colleges, the patterns of task force recommendations, faculty retirements and strategic college and university priorities point to the desirability of reorganizing selected departments to have fewer, stronger and more sustainable units and programs. The key concern in these cases is sustainability: to maintain areas of teaching and research, some of them at reduced levels, in the context of no real growth in overall university resources, and the need to achieve economies for administrative costs and faculty time. Experience has shown the difficulties and costs of maintaining small units. Our funding environment indicates that the university cannot rely on resource increases to

grow our way out of small economies of scale in these units. To define sustainable academic units will require disestablishing some existing departments, programs or majors in favour of fewer new ones based on creative re-imagining of departments and programming using the best available ideas. In the process, the colleges concerned will need to consider the relationship of departments to disciplines or interdisciplinarity; the significance for students of the titles of courses, majors or degrees; and the significance or not of co-location of groups of faculty and staff; among other factors.

Our funding environment indicates that the university cannot rely on resource increases to grow our way out of small economies of scale in these units.

- For arts and science, the dean has been asked to achieve program changes in specific departments, primarily in the humanities and fine arts, aimed at directing more students to a degree outcome; to address the issues of small departments, interdisciplinary programs and three-year Bachelor of Arts (BA) programs across the college.
- For engineering, the dean will be looked to for leading changes to departmental names and new program options, including new graduate programming and a co-operative education initiative for undergraduate students.
- For medicine, the dean has been asked to reconceptualize the biomedical science programs within medicine and with other units such as pharmacy and nutrition to reduce duplication, bring coherence to program offerings, increase effectiveness/efficiency in resource use and support institutional mission.
- For veterinary medicine, the dean has been asked to pursue changes to departmental structures and graduate programming in clinical and basic science departments, and to lead college engagement with Prairie Diagnostic Services, to ensure they are integrated for impact, profile and efficiency.
- For the University Library, the dean has been asked to refocus the information literacy/library instruction program to be delivered through self-help online access and/or through integration into for-credit courses.

The many changes that are contemplated in reorganize and simplify related programming across colleges for increased impact and profile and reorganize programs and departmental structures within selected colleges are important for programs and structures to be sustainable given the impact of incentivized faculty retirements; to keep future cost growth down and to keep programs strong in an environment of constrained resources; and also to achieve some shorter-term cost reductions that together contribute significantly toward our budget targets. While the overall impact will mean significant change to undergraduate and graduate programs and to departmental structures, as well as some savings that will contribute to university financial targets, the main purpose of these changes is to shift activity to provide greater impact and profile. Opportunities for faculty involvement in articulating new programming, in shaping the outcomes and in

driving the academic changes necessary will be vital in order to ensure that the new structures and programs to be created are informed by the best available thinking.

- **Reorganize international functions and services.** This project directly addresses the support services transformation task force's observation about the fragmentation[v] of services for undergraduate and graduate students. It is about ending the current dispersal of international resources and activities in multiple offices, to bring them together under coherent leadership to ensure maximum impact and to minimize the risks of unco-ordinated growth and cost increases. This project is a response to a clear message in the task force reports about the profile of international activities and about how they are provided to students and faculty. It involves the development of a new administrative model to organize and streamline units responsible for student and faculty mobility in order to place greater emphasis on international activities overall.

- **Improve co-ordination of programs and services for First Nations, Métis and Inuit students.** The third integrated plan identified co-ordination of Aboriginal activities as foundational to our future success and both the academic[vi] and support services[vii] task forces recommended ways to address these programs and services for increased impact and profile. Similar to the previous project, this one is about bringing together existing resources for maximum efficiency and impact. It is also about ensuring co-ordination with and among college services. Building on this approach, the co-ordination of Aboriginal student programming will be addressed through the creation of a framework for engaging with Aboriginal communities, as well as through support programming specifically geared to ensuring student success in our academic programs. Some components of the university's future success and co-ordination are clear. The Gordon Oakes-Red Bear Student Centre will be an important hub. The university will want to consider our over forty-year record of successful transition programs. The College of Arts and Science Aboriginal Student Achievement Program will play a lead role in ensuring that students enter and succeed in first-year programs, which also sets them up for success in professional programs. The project will consider how these successful programs work together and how other existing and new initiatives across the campus will be co-ordinated with them. As this work is carried out, the opinions of students will be particularly important so as to effectively shape these programs with their needs in mind.

- **Revitalize interdisciplinary structures.** This project builds on the commentary in the academic programs task force report about interdisciplinary programming[viii] and is about developing new models for interdisciplinarity that are effective and that are less expensive than the multiplication of stand-alone academic units. This project is mainly about improving the effectiveness of existing resources and providing mechanisms for (re-) allocation of those resources to emergent program areas, while ensuring appropriate academic governance and planning. It is also about ending individual interdisciplinary

programs sponsored under the College of Graduate Studies and Research and ensuring that other structures[ix] exist to accommodate interdisciplinary graduate programming.

The effect of the changes described above will be that the university will have fewer and stronger units that are sustainable into the future and staff, faculty and leaders at all levels who are empowered and have authority to act.

Theme two: Focus on the core mission

Estimated cost savings of $2.0 million

Seven projects under this heading will tighten the university's focus in support of university-level learning and discovery. These projects will involve winding down some selected areas of university activity, and more generally distinguishing activities that closely support the core academic mission from others that do not, with appropriate organizational and funding structures in each case. Clarity and effectiveness are key considerations in these projects, including ensuring that resources are concentrated in the long term behind the university's priorities and that growth in non-core costs and activities is limited in the future.

Vision: To be recognized among the most distinguished research-intensive universities in North America and world-leading in targeted areas of education and research, knowing that we serve Saskatchewan best by helping to solve global challenges that have particular relevance to our region, and by striving to lead the nation in Aboriginal post-secondary education initiatives that meet community needs.

Our university's vision is "to be recognized among the most distinguished research-intensive universities in North America and world-leading in targeted areas of education and research, knowing that we serve Saskatchewan best by helping to solve global challenges that have particular relevance to our region, and by striving to lead the nation in Aboriginal post-secondary education initiatives that meet community needs." Our primary missions are learning and discovery, each best accomplished in the presence of the other.

For over a century, the University of Saskatchewan has served the people of Saskatchewan and of Canada in a variety of ways. During that time, our environment has changed considerably. The University of Saskatchewan is no longer the only post-secondary institution in the province and now functions as part of a diverse post-secondary sector that includes numerous agencies and that has an international reach. In an era of constrained resources, it is responsible for us to focus on the things a research-intensive medical-doctoral university can uniquely do within a wider post-secondary sector. The task force reports made clear that it is now time to focus on degree credit teaching and peer-reviewed research, and to review or

reconsider other aspects of service and administration that are secondary to our mission. This includes reconsideration of outreach activities[x] and non-degree-credit education. The university is and will continue to be committed to providing programs and services to the people of Saskatchewan, particularly to First Nations, Métis and Inuit people who are under-served and under-represented in our programs, and to northern, rural or remote communities even while we change how we do this in a substantial way. As our foundational document on Outreach and Engagement (2006) and the university's new vision statement have made clear, community and Aboriginal engagement are integral to our teaching and research.

…the university will move away from its historical mission of centrally organizing non-degree credit programming to a new model where non-degree programs, outreach and service are prioritized and provided by academic units only where they are essential to the unit's core academic mission.

Given these considerations, the university will concentrate resources on the activities that are central to our academic mission, will reduce activities that are less central, and will eliminate activities that are seen to be peripheral by our colleges and schools. In so doing, the university will move away from its historical mission of centrally organizing non-degree credit programming to a new model where non-degree programs, outreach and service are prioritized and provided by academic units (colleges, schools and centres), only where they are essential to the unit's core academic mission and where the resources allocated to them do not detract from the academic mission. Administrative units will be redesigned around supporting colleges and academic units rather than undertaking outreach or service on their own. Actions taken under this theme also include providing greater role clarity for several central administrative units and functions, as well as how alumni and the general public are engaged in the academic mission of the university.

Through all of this, the provost's committee wants to signal the continued importance of partnerships with our community-based organizations and within the educational sector. Indeed, through this plan, we are signaling that we will be increasingly reliant on our partners, including St. Thomas More College, to offer or support some programs that the university can no longer offer or support on its own.

This increased focus on core mission is particularly evident in the restructuring that is currently underway in the College of Medicine, and indeed defines the character of that transformation. From our review of both task force reports, it is very clear that both strongly supported the vision articulated in *The Way Forward*, which set out the blueprint for the necessary changes to that college and which represents over two years of work to date to address the accreditation issues within the Doctor of Medicine (MD) program. In focusing the college on the success of degree programs and peer-reviewed research, and moving away from diverting academic resources to clinical service, the university is returning to the roots of

what it is for: to offer high-quality degree programs and research that support and serve the interests of the people of the province, the nation and the world.

A second way in which PCIP has interpreted this theme is to address fee-for-service and internal cost-recovery activities[xi], a theme that was prominent in the support service transformation task force report. A variety of units in our university support the costs of service (including paying for staff positions) by charging service fees to other parts of the university. The scale of these internal charges is excessive for a university our size; it adds costs in processing transactions and it also makes missions, roles and planning less transparent. While work to review such fees was already underway, the support services task force used its report to make it clear that these fees and practices hinder our work both within the university and within the broader community. The efforts here will be focused on service standards covered by budget allocations with fees eliminated altogether or substantially minimized except for less mission-central activities (such as for continuing professional education programs). The maximize value of the university spend (MVUS) project within OBA, currently under the leadership of the associate vice-president financial services, will be tasked with this work with targets of providing a policy framework by the end of December 2014 and with significant progress over the next two fiscal years. The situation is not sustainable and, given the transition to our new budget model, this is now the time to address the fee-for-service issue.

Changes that form part of this theme have profound implications for two of our university's units, CCDE and eMAP, both of which will be dissolved as entities of the university by December 31, 2014.

CCDE was created with the disestablishment of the Extension Division in 2006 and as a response to the outreach and engagement foundational document. It is the centre that has provided the greatest contact with our provincial educational system, serving as the university's representative to the regional colleges and as part of our distributed learning enterprise. It is best known locally for the many programs of community interest that are offered annually, including language courses, music, business and leadership programs, and personal and professional interest programs. It has operated these programs on the principle of cost recovery, never quite fully realizing that mandate and with few resources from central sources to address the distributed learning activities of the university. These activities will be drawn to a close and those functions that directly support for-credit instruction, including English programming from the languages centre, relationships with the regional colleges and support for distributed degree-credit learning, will be transferred to a different structure within the VPTL portfolio. Programs, courses and certificates such as programs for seniors, the Prairie Horticulture Certificate, and business and leadership programs that make sense to various colleges and schools will be transferred directly to academic units; announcements about outcomes of these various programs are anticipated in June 2014. A proposal will be

brought forward for University Council's approval to disestablish the CCDE as a type B centre in fall 2014.

In the same way, eMAP will be dissolved and functions that directly support for-credit instruction and peer-reviewed research activities considered essential to the university's core mission will be transferred to new reporting areas effective December 31, 2014. Because this unit operates many activities on a fee-for-service/cost-recovery basis, sometimes in direct competition with external agencies, and has a variety of contracts and arrangements with various customers, winding down the business operations will take some time. All current fee-for-service agreements will be carefully reviewed and appropriate actions taken. In doing all of this work, the provost's committee will ensure that University Council, through its teaching, learning and academic resources committee, is fully apprised of the changes that are proposed, and that consultations are held with colleges and schools through the associate deans forums and other regular meetings to ensure that the university achieves the end result of a streamlined operation that more fully and adequately addresses the needs of our campus. To support this transition, funding will be provided from the annual sustaining capital grant and from the operating budget to fully equip and complete classroom enhancements and technology upgrades by 2017.

Finally, in this theme area, three additional projects are proposed. The first is intended to clarify mandate and roles for selected administrative offices. The second is intended to focus activities and operations of some museums and galleries into a unit that is equipped to catalogue and display these holdings more effectively than is currently the case. The third is to organize conference and event management to reduce duplication of expertise across campus, increase service quality and identify necessary registration systems to effectively support conferences and events on campus.

Project briefs are under development for a number of sub-projects under this theme; project titles are provided below.

- Complete the College of Medicine restructure
- Align continuing and distance education activities with core mission
- Align eMAP activities with core mission
- Restructure the collections and operations of the University Art Collection and the Museum of Antiquities within the University Library
- Establish a governance framework to eliminate fee-for-service arrangements
- Amalgamate and consolidate conference and event planning
- Ensure role clarity for selected units for core mission

Theme three: Share services: Work together across unit boundaries

Estimated cost savings of $7.5 million

One of the most important areas of work resulting from this plan involves creating a new organizational design for administrative and support services throughout the university. This reconceptualization of how services are provided in support of the academic mission will involve staff in colleges/schools, staff in clusters or regions of colleges/schools, and staff in central units. The concept is for services provided at different levels and in different units to be co-ordinated in such a way that jobs are clear, opportunities are available for staff to develop specialized expertise and advance in their careers, and standards of service for students, faculty and clients are well-defined and consistent. Where needed, staff will be embedded in local units to provide service close at hand; where feasible, they will be concentrated in service clusters for specialized functions; and the organizational structure for each service will be vertically integrated throughout the university. PCIP is confident that changes in this area will enhance services, reduce costs, provide services more equitably across campus, and also limit future cost increases for administrative and support services.

Our university's thinking on shared services goes back several years. During the global economic downturn of 2008/09, and as part of our Board of Governor's directive to look at cost savings as a matter of good stewardship, the service process enhancement project (SPEP) was established and it identified many opportunities for service improvements and cost savings across the university. One of the recommendations, based on input from the campus community, was the advancement of a new organizational design that focused on a shared services approach for the provision of administrative and support services. At that time the university addressed a major change in the communications organizational design, but did not aggressively pursue wider shared services because of the high complexity of change. In 2012, when the university embarked on operating budget adjustments, organizational design was identified as a potential strategy to improve service and reduce costs. In that same year, because of large increases in the university staff complement in a 10-year period, as reported at University Council in September 2012, colleges, schools and administrative units were informed, through the fall 2012 planning parameters documents, of PCIP's desire to look at administrative and support staff organizational design. Over the past year and in the lead-up to the release of the task force reports, further background research was conducted based on the work that was completed in the second planning cycle for the commitment on "working together across unit boundaries." We learned from our association with the Education Advisory Board (EAB) that shared services are being instituted in many higher education institutions; leading academic institutions such as Oregon State University, University of California Berkeley, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Yale University are early adopters.

Based on the EAB research and our own experience, the traditional generalist model at universities for provision of administrative and support services is not working well in terms of efficiency and quality of services. This traditional service model involves looking to a few staff to be skilled and continuously improve their skills in many different functions such as finance, IT and human relations. The increased professional requirements for training and specialization in services due to more complex and sophisticated systems, regulations and reporting has rendered the generalist service model incapable of meeting today's and future standards and expectations for service. Further, the traditional generalist model does not enable universities to achieve economies of scale as managers tend to have a limited number of direct reports.

This multi-functional university-wide project is intended to improve the university's support services by reducing duplicate, fragmented and competitive administrative services by reorganizing them into a new structure which will include local (decentralized), regional (hybrid) and centralized provision of services.

Given the detail in which the support services task force reviewed support service functions, the recommendations verified that there is a lack of organizational coordination and role clarity, along with duplication, overlap, competition and redundancy within and among functional service areas. TransformUS has amplified the magnitude and urgency and provided us with validation to proceed with implementing a shared services model. Our intention now is to think bigger and bolder to realize the service enhancements and savings possible within a two-year window for full implementation. The initial work involves designing a functional service structure, assessing what we currently do on campus and developing a proposal for the deans to review in early fall 2014, along with the establishment of a prototype within the year.

A shared services model represents re-conceiving the structure and connection of our administrative and support services, primarily to determine what should be done in colleges, schools and units, in regions or clusters, and centrally. This multi-functional university-wide project is intended to improve the university's support services by reducing duplicate, fragmented and competitive administrative services by reorganizing them into a new structure which will include local (decentralized), regional (hybrid) and centralized provision of services. The intention is to horizontally co-ordinate seven functional service areas as well as vertically integrate the services provided within each of these administrative functions and services. The seven functional service areas being considered are:

- Human resources
- Information technology
- Financial services
- Student services
- Communications, development, alumni relations

- Research services
- Facilities management

Over the next two years, actions under this theme will affect almost every level of the university and virtually every employee at the university, either directly or indirectly. The goal is to create a new functional service design, enhance service quality for students and faculty throughout the university, and reduce costs and growth of costs over time through a smaller workforce. For our current staff this will require extensive change, both in process re-design, reporting relationships and re-training. For current and future administrative and support staff, this initiative will provide more opportunities for personal and professional development, greater clarity of roles and responsibilities, improved career pathways, enhanced training, more specialized roles and increased job satisfaction.

Due to the magnitude of the changes being contemplated, PCIP anticipates that our journey will be arduous. The campus community will need to be patient and supportive as our university enters into one of the most beneficial and difficult to achieve organizational design projects for our support services. However, the overall goal is to better support the learning and discovery missions of the university and in so doing provide students and faculty with the type of supports that they need to be successful. If we can achieve the highest international service standards and levels, we will be among the most efficient universities in the U15.

Theme four: Incorporate prioritization into ongoing practice

Estimated cost savings of $4.0 million

Actions under this theme focus on the linkages between planning, budgeting and resource allocation, and outcomes assessment. Given the introduction of our new budgeting process, which is a responsibility centre management model built on the principles of openness and transparency (among other principles), deans, executive directors, associate vice-presidents and administrative unit leaders will be called upon to articulate priorities, to understand the alignment of unit-specific priorities with institution-wide priorities outlined in integrated plans and planning documents, and to allocate their unit's resources accordingly.

There are three components under this theme. First, actions outlined in this theme area will represent selective disinvestments in various units based on the patterns of TransformUS task force recommendations and PCIP's reflections in consultation with unit leaders. Generally, these targeted budget cuts reflect the idea that programs and services are to be "maintained with reduced resourcing," and the dean, executive director or unit leader will be responsible to develop and report on a plan for how to redesign or reorganize programs or services to be sustainable on resourced or new revenue generation. A second component will be selective investments (anticipated beginning in 2015/16 fiscal year) in programs and/or units where

they align with institutional priorities, support the learning and discovery missions of the university and advance the university's overall goals. The third component will be the full introduction of the new envelope budgeting system in 2015/16, which will support ongoing prioritization in resource allocation within the colleges and planning units of the university. In short, the university will selectively disinvest and invest in 2014/15 and 2015/16, and through the new budget model will also look to colleges and other planning units to prioritize internally in the future. This theme represents the core of integrated planning—putting resources behind priorities and making progress toward agreed-upon outcomes.

This theme represents the core of integrated planning—putting resources behind priorities and making progress toward outcomes.

Beginning from the observation of the academic programs task force that, in an era of resource constraint, a quintile 3 (Q3) placement (maintain with reduced resourcing) is "normal treatment," the provost's committee has signaled to some unit leaders that there is an expectation to reorganize services, programs and staff complements sustainably to accommodate differentiated levels of budgetary reductions. In assessing the budgetary implications of TransformUS, PCIP began by looking at the proportion of each unit's activity that was ranked by the task forces in Q3. In addition, PCIP considered strategic priorities of the third integrated plan, as well as the first years of outcomes of the TABBS budget model. The resulting budget treatment of different units can be summed up as follows:

- In some cases, the sense of "maintain with reduced resourcing" has already been fully implemented for certain units through the impact of the incentive plan for retirement for faculty.
- In other cases, the combination of incentivized retirements together with reorganization projects mandated under the first theme in this plan will fully accomplish "maintain with reduced resources."
- Where incentivized retirements and reorganization projects are not sufficient to produce the budget reductions needed by the university, selected units are being assigned additional, targeted budget reductions.
- In a few cases, impacts of incentivized retirements and other changes may exceed the contribution the university currently expects and needs from a given unit. PCIP will consider such cases as part of the pattern of reinvestment in subsequent stages of the action plan according to the criteria outlined below.

Among colleges and units the combined impacts of faculty retirements and targeted budget reductions range from zero to 13 per cent of operating-budget allocations. An indication of college and unit overall contributions to the themes in this action plan is available as a resource.

Where targeted budget reductions are required, unit leaders will be asked to prepare plans to deal with the additional reduction and have these plans to be approved by PCIP. As a result, selected activities, programs and services will be discontinued through normal processes. Leaders will need to advance creative solutions, do some things differently and stop doing others. Further, PCIP is requiring all units to address outcomes for programs and services identified for reduced resources (Q3) or phase out (subject to review) (Q5) where these have not been otherwise addressed in this plan.

Prioritization also represents investment in priorities as an essential part of this plan. These selective investments will consider several criteria:

- quintile 1 (Q1), candidate for enhanced resourcing, recommendations of the task forces;
- strategic priorities of the university and of units as grounded in our signature areas and the priorities outlined in *Promise and Potential*, the third integrated plan;
- opportunities to support lasting, transformative changes in programs and services; and
- information provided by TABBS.

High priorities for investments following these criteria include funding for new faculty positions; expanded student support, including increased graduate scholarship funding; and small investments such as upgrades to the graduate information system and classroom technology enhancements that facilitate completion of the actions outlined in this plan. Further priorities will be identified through conversation with senior leaders, planning and priorities committee of council and the Board of Governors in particular. Units have been asked to be mindful of the suggestions they put forward in their submitted templates outlining requests for increased or new investments, and to look at how they may use existing resources to fund these initiatives. The provost's committee has reviewed these and thinks there are many useful suggestions for deans, executive directors and associate vice-presidents to consider when directing or redirecting resources within their budget envelope when opportunities permit. We have concluded that it will be important to have achieved some of the savings in this plan before large-scale investments can begin to occur, and, based on progress in implementing the actions in this plan, will target 2015/16 as the year in which these investments may begin.

As this set of projects are confirmed, we are reminded that in the future the university's new budget model, TABBS, presents an opportunity for colleges and schools to review the budgets of the support centres through the soon-to-be-established support centre budget review committee, and to have input into the budget allocations to the support centres in the future based on satisfaction with service levels and alignment with college/school priorities. We anticipate that the establishment of the budget review committee will increase transparency of budgets and service standards for administrative units.

Finally, PCIP sees an important opportunity to partner with University Council and its committees in the actions that follow from the TransformUS task force reports, including those related to this theme. PCIP has identified a review of University Council's existing policy framework associated with viable enrolments as a point of connection to this action plan and is signaling its interest in working with council to adjust this policy based on the program prioritization experience. Other potential areas for council's consideration include an examination by council's committees, such as the academic programs committee, of the prioritization framework used by the academic programs task force and its potential for incorporation into templates used by the committee when proposals for new or revised programs are brought forward for approval or for program termination. PCIP also looks forward to partnering with University Council in identifying a structure with dedicated resources for interdisciplinary programs; in assessing related programs in different units; in ensuring that Aboriginal academic programs flourish; and in assessing the balance between new programs and existing programs over the coming years.

NEXT STEPS, IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

The preceding sections have outlined, under four themes, 19 major projects to be launched shortly, with the intention of making our university more sustainable through their combined impact. The facilitation of these actions through our governance process and final implementation will be overseen by the university's senior leadership, through PCIP, with project teams established to support all significant initiatives and to engage with faculty, staff and students within the time available to garner the best available ideas. To do this, a project management approach will be used that will require progress reports from project leaders at regular intervals and regular reporting on outcomes to the campus community and governing bodies of the university.

Actions contained in this plan will be implemented following the normal governance processes for decision-making. In the case of academic programs or academic units, this means discussion and debate in collegial bodies and committees, as well as discussion, debate and approval in our decision-making, governing bodies: University Council, University Senate and the Board of Governors. For administrative services, this generally means a more straightforward decision process, particularly for those actions that are under the purview of an administrative unit leader or vice-presidential portfolio. For administrative actions, there will be a requirement to keep faculty and students informed and involved (where appropriate) and to ensure that the role of the Board of Governors in approving budgets is upheld, as well as that employment agreements and legislation are followed. For academic programming changes, PCIP envisions that these will be led and championed by deans with significant involvement and leadership by faculty and with opportunities for student involvement; there is also a requirement to ensure that the role of the Board of Governors in approving budgets is upheld, as well as that employment agreements and legislation are followed.

To support this action plan, PCIP has tentatively identified timelines in which we anticipate that the projects we have identified will proceed. We have done this because our university cannot do everything at once, although we recognize that swift and decisive action in many instances will be most beneficial to the campus community. In the support services and functions this is more readily accomplished given that management can proceed to restructure its operations quickly and decisively. In the area of academic programs, actions are dependent on discussions with faculty, collegial decision-making and proposals to governing bodies, so they may proceed at a different rate and sequence. Further, this action plan is formulated in a general way to support the university's senior leaders to carry out the work identified in this plan and project briefs, particularly the deans, executive directors and associate vice-presidents who are expected to lead many of the projects described here. Given these considerations, PCIP expects that the actions identified in this plan will be given priority in discussions within colleges/schools, departments and units, and required proposals will be brought forward for decision by governing bodies by 2016 at the very latest. Wherever possible, decisions and actions must be completed sooner than this in order to achieve financial targets and minimize uncertainty. Within the necessary time constraints, it is expected that faculty and students will be involved in shaping outcomes for several of the projects and that project leaders will include them in meaningful ways. To support incorporation of the student voice at the institutional level, a student forum will be created to ensure consideration of student opinion and feedback in relation to several areas of university finances.

In sequencing the projects in this way, PCIP believes that it should be evident that we are serious about obtaining the outcomes—both increased efficiency and increased effectiveness—for both academic and support service programs. Our university activities must be strong and sustainable; our programs must be distinctive; our university must be focused.

We will update the campus community regularly on progress and will work with our campus community to remove obstacles that are within our power to do so.

CONCLUSION

This is the first time that our university has looked at both program and service offerings together in a comprehensive manner. The action plan described above presents a set of interconnected projects that represent a substantial body of work for our university over the coming months and years. It also represents a critical milestone in the evolution of our planning process, whereby the university will move forward from a period of growth and expansion toward an ongoing and systematic process of prioritization, thereby ensuring the ongoing financial sustainability of the university.

Our program prioritization process, TransformUS, has equipped us to address a significant challenge and we are at a critical juncture in our university's history. Action is now required to

address the duplicate, fragmented and competitive programs and services that we have sponsored over the years, and focus our resources more pointedly to achieve the results that we have collectively agreed upon through the plans and planning documents discussed and approved by our governing bodies over the past decade.

The needed changes in our university cannot be accomplished without some service disruption and significant impact on current work. A key consideration must be to reduce uncertainty and bring clarity as soon as feasible regarding the shape of future programs and services. As the university embarks on these projects, PCIP will be particularly mindful of the impact on faculty and student services, which are the two areas our task forces have requested we place at the forefront of our thinking.

Our Board of Governors has challenged management to leave "no stone unturned." University Council has challenged us to ensure that the academic core of the university is protected. We have heard these messages. We have taken them to heart. We have committed to openness and transparency, and the way we are presenting this plan and the associated projects is a key fulfillment of that commitment.

In the preceding pages the provost's committee has outlined a coherent and comprehensive plan that will support the goal of being a financially sustainable university. This plan requires co-ordinated and sequenced action. It now requires the leadership and courage of the university's leadership, faculty, students and staff to achieve it. The result will be a more resilient university, one that is less likely to have structural deficits in the future and will more effectively dedicate resources to priorities. The ultimate purpose is to enable our whole community to focus on the most important, central mission—learning and discovery, and the unique contributions our university can make to Saskatchewan and to the world.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

The following resources are available online:

- Academic program transformation task force report
- Support service transformation task force report
- Principles and criteria for development of the TransformUS implementation plan
- TransformUS data analysis
  - Summary of feedback from consultation and feedback phase
  - Feedback from committees of University Council:
    - Forward from the planning and priorities committee
    - Academic programs committee
    - Governance committee
    - International activities committee
    - Planning and priorities committee
    - Research, scholarly and artistic work committee
    - Scholarship and awards committee
    - Teaching, learning and academic resources committee
  - Aboriginal programs analysis
  - Interdisciplinary programs analysis
  - Research programs analysis
  - Results by discipline
  - Relationship between task force composition and quintile results
  - TransformUS and systematic program review (SPR) results comparison
- TransformUS changes to senior administration
- Summary of college, school and unit contributions to the action plan themes
- University of Saskatchewan vision document (2014)
- *Promise and Potential*, the third integrated plan (includes the multi-year operating budget framework)
- Transparent activity-based budget system website

This plan is accompanied by a set of project briefs outlining cross-institutional and large-scale unit-based projects of university-wide interest, and a document indicating how PCIP addressed all of the recommendations of the two task forces. These documents will be available online (NSID protected) on May 1, 2014.

SUPPORTING QUOTES FROM TASK FORCE REPORTS (ENDNOTES)

[i] "We would encourage other academic units to look at the range of programs they offer with a view to deciding whether all of them can be sustained as vibrant and distinct programs. It may be, for example, that a unit could strengthen its undergraduate programs by creating more specialize streams, options or clusters within programs rather [than] trying to maintain a host of independent programs." (APT task force report, page 21)

[ii] "...the task force concluded that the number of programs with low graduation rates (or in the case of graduate programs, long completion times) was a cause for concern for many obvious reasons, including the additional burden placed on students with extra time in program and the extra resources required to support them." (APT task force report, page 19)

[iii] "Over time, the university has developed a deep administrative layer. This complicated organizational structure is not only expensive but has resulted in an inequity of roles, reports and responsibilities in administrative positions at the same level, reporting structures that lack transparency and are inefficient, and diffuse accountabilities." (SST task force report, page 6)

[iv] "…encourages the university to undertake a comprehensive review of support services funded substantially by transfer of the operating budget and determine, in each case, the proper balance of direct operating budget support and cost recovery." (SST task force report, page 6)

[v] "Support services directed to international undergraduate and graduate students appear to be minimal and, once again, fragmented." (SST task force report, page 7)

[vi] "…their alignment with the stated strategic aspirations of the university, albeit significant, was only one in the list of criteria on which our evaluation was based…some of the programs with an Aboriginal focus have languished because the unit of the university has not devoted sufficient resources or attention to them, and some have apparently failed to tap into sufficient student demand to make them sustainable." (APT task force report, page 19)

[vii] "The university is encouraged to review the host of support services it now provides to Aboriginal students in multiple academic and administrative units with a view to building on current successes without proliferation of administration." (SST task force report, page 6)

[viii] "Our general observation was that the interdisciplinary programs that did less well in our assessment were those that were most heavily reliant on volunteer efforts of faculty to sustain them. Many interdisciplinary programs could demonstrate that they had a strong alignment with the strategic directions of the institution, but this was only one component of our assessment. Some programs received lower scores because no significant investment of dedicated resources had been made in them, and this was often linked to poor or uncertain

outcomes, low levels of demand from students or other constituencies, and an inability to realize fully the collaborative potential of the program." (APT task force report, page 16)

[ix] "The interdisciplinary climate has changed since these programs were first established. Virtually all academic units are engaged in interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary activity with other parts of the university. In this context, it seems that it would be possible to accommodate the interdisciplinary interests of graduate students within other graduate programs or under the auspices of academic units." (APT task force report, page 18)

[x] "The task force suggests the university work to articulate specific objectives for outreach programs, and take steps to better measure success and cost effectiveness of these support services….many outreach activities have a long history and it is unclear whetehr they continue to be relevant to the current mission of the university." (SST task force report, page 21)

[xi] "…it is important to identify those situations where providing services to external clients reduces availability of the service to internal users, where revenues generated may be used by units to support activities which are not well aligned with university priorities, or where the university is competing unfairly with private sector vendors who have to cover the overhead costs of their operations." (SST task force report, page 6)

AGENDA ITEM NO: 12.1

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL **ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE REQUEST FOR DECISION**

PRESENTED BY: Roy Dobson, Chair, Academic Programs Committee of Council

DATE OF MEETING: May 22, 2014

SUBJECT: **General Honours Degree – program termination**

DECISION REQUESTED:

It is recommended:
That Council approve the termination of the General Honours program in the College of Arts and Science, effective September 2014.

PURPOSE:
University Council approves termination of academic programs.

SUMMARY:
The General Honours program in the College of Arts and Science predates the existence of program minors, and is currently very rarely used. The program requirements for a General Honours program are similar to the requirements for a Four-year degree with two minors, but unlike a Four-year degree with two minors, a General Honours program requires the approval of all three departments involved in the program. Since the result of the General Honours program can be achieved by different means with lower administrative overhead through the use of minors, the College of Arts and Science has proposed to terminate the General Honours program.

REVIEW:
The Academic Programs Committee discussed this proposal with Alexis Dahl, Director of Programs, Arts and Science. The committee agreed that the General Honours program was redundant and, since it required more administration than similar options, was a good candidate for termination.

ATTACHMENTS:
Proposal documents; Letters of support.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Report Form for Program Termination

Program(s) to be deleted: General Honours

Effective date of termination: September 2014

1. List reasons for termination and describe the background leading to this decision.

The College of Arts & Science currently offers the opportunity for students to earn a General Honours Degree, defined in the *Course and Program Catalogue* (CPC) as:

> *General Honours Programs:* General Honours Programs may be taken in allowable combinations of three subjects.
>
> Of the 120 credit units required for a General Honours, at least 84 will be distributed amongst three subjects. The student will take at least 36 and not more than 48 credit units from among the courses prescribed for Honours in one subject and select the remainder from other subjects to build an individual program which would satisfy a particular academic interest. The student will take a minimum of 18 credit units and not more than 30 credit units in each of the other subjects. The program being considered must be approved by each of the three departments and the Undergraduate Student Office.

The General Honours option has existed for a very long time (prior to the development of Double Honours, minors and certificates), but is now very rarely used. A student may now construct a similar program through the choice of a Four-year program and two minors/certificates, without the need for approval in as many as three departments. The recommendation of the Academic Programs Coordinating Committee, College of Arts & Science is that this program option is no longer necessary, and therefore should be deleted.

2. Technical information.

2.1 Courses offered in the program and faculty resources required for these courses.

n/a

2.2 Other resources (staff, technology, physical resources, etc) used for this program.

The rare student in this program requires a significant amount of advising from departments and the UGSO staff.

2.3 Courses to be deleted, if any.

n/a

2.4 Number of students presently enrolled.

0

2.5 Number of students enrolled and graduated over the last five years.

0

---

3. Impact of the termination.

Internal

3.1 What if any impact will this termination have on undergraduate and graduate students? How will they be advised to complete their programs?

None. Students can construct a similar program through use of the Double Honours, or a Major and two Minors.

3.2 What impact will this termination have on faculty and teaching assignments?

None.

3.3 Will this termination affect other programs, departments or colleges?

No.

3.4 If courses are also to be deleted, will these deletions affect any other programs?

n/a

3.5 Is it likely, or appropriate, that another department or college will develop a program to replace this one?

No.

3.6 Is it likely, or appropriate, that another department or college will develop courses to replace the ones deleted?

n/a

3.7 Describe any impact on research projects.

None.

3.8 Will this deletion affect resource areas such as library resources, physical facilities, and information technology?

No.

3.9 Describe the budgetary implications of this deletion.

None.

External

3.10 Describe any external impact (e.g. university reputation, accreditation, other institutions, high schools, community organizations, professional bodies).

None. This program is very rarely chosen, and students can construct a similar structure through the Double Honours or combination of Major/Minors.

3.11 Is it likely or appropriate that another educational institution will offer this program if it is deleted at the University of Saskatchewan?

No.

Other

3.12 Are there any other relevant impacts or considerations?

No. This is a disused program option.

3.13 Please provide any statements or opinions received about this termination.

Possibilities for the future of this program were discussed by the College of Arts & Science's Divisional Academic Programs Committees, in response to a proposal to rename the program. 1 Division voted to accept the proposed new name, and two Divisions recommended that the program either be deleted or renamed to indicate that this is not an "Honours" level program (students graduating from the program may not be prepared for Graduate work in any available discipline). The proposal was returned to the Academic Programs Coordinating Committee (College wide committee), and the final recommendation was to delete the program option. Students can construct a similar learning structure through other available options.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

MEMORANDUM

TO: Roy Dobson, Chair, Academic Programs Committee

FROM: Peta Bonham-Smith, Vice-Dean (Science)
Linda McMullen, Acting Vice-Dean (Social Sciences)
David Parkinson, Vice-Dean (Humanities and Fine Arts)

DATE: March 31, 2014

RE: Deletion of the General Honours program option in the College of Arts and Science

---

This memo confirms that the College of Arts & Science supports the deletion of the General Honours program option, as set out in the Program Termination form. Because of the creation of Double Honours, Minor and Certificate options, this program is no longer needed as a route for students to design and be recognized for interdisciplinary study.

As there are no students currently enrolled in this program option, there will be no impact on the student body.

The proposal to delete the program option was circulated to members of the College through the Arts & Science Course and Program Challenge (October 2013). The proposal was approved by each of the three Divisional Academic Programs Committees:

Humanities and Fine Arts: October 23, 2013
Science: October 22, 2013
Social Science: November 4, 2013

The proposal was subsequently approved by each of the three Divisional Faculty Councils:

Humanities and Fine Arts: February 26, 2013
Science: February 25, 2013
Social Science: February 24, 2013

Peta Bonham-Smith	Linda McMullen	David Parkinson