

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m., observing that quorum had been attained.

1. Adoption of the agenda

MICHELMANN/PARKINSON: To adopt the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Opening remarks

The chair welcomed members and visitors. Given the large number of attendees, he described Council's usual procedures for debate and discussion, and his usual practice of consulting with the university secretary on any questions raised for the chair's consideration.

The chair commented on a concern raised by a Council member about the Council committee responses to the TransformUS task force reports, clarifying that the committees' responses were not done on behalf of Council but rather reflect the views of the committees. In accordance with its terms of reference, the planning and priorities committee is responsible to seek advice from other Council committees to facilitate university-wide academic planning; the committee is also responsible to provide advice to senior administration and report to Council on the nature of such advice. In its report before Council today, the planning and priorities committee will report to Council on its advice to the provost's committee on integrated planning (PCIP) regarding the TransformUS process and task force reports.

3. Minutes of the meeting of January 23, 2014

A correction to the minutes was requested on page 6 in the third line of the second paragraph to change the word "infanticide" to "infantilize".

MAKAROVA/DOBSON: That the Council minutes of January 23, 2014 be approved as circulated with the correction as noted.

CARRIED

4. Business from the minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the President

President Ilene Busch-Vishniac referred members to her written report as contained in the printed meeting materials, and noted a number of additional items. She acknowledged the work of the USSU in bringing a fall reading week forward and expressed her thanks to members of the USSU, Russell Isinger, registrar, Patti McDougall, vice-provost teaching and learning and others for their work on this initiative. Best wishes were extended to the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) for the work on the conference and gala the GSA will host next week.

Regarding the federal budget, the president noted that the budget specifically included \$1.5B over the next decade for a Canada research excellence fund (formerly referred to as 'ACRE'). Although the fund announced is half of the request submitted, the president noted it is nonetheless a very positive response from the federal government. She also noted the budget included increases to Tri-Agency funding roughly equivalent to inflation, funding for Mitacs and many items linking students to businesses. The president also noted the federal commitment of \$1.9B to First Nations' control of First Nations' education. The president was in attendance when the announcement was made by the Prime Minister and commented that those in attendance felt that history was being made with a new appreciation of the importance of First Nations controlling the education for their students. Regarding the provincial budget expected to be released March 19<sup>th</sup>, the president noted that a tight budget is anticipated and further information will be provided when known.

The president commented that the university's challenge is to determine when, how and with whom the university should partner. The fundamental philosophy is for the university to embrace partnerships that bring advantages accessible to each of the partners involved. She informed Council that an important new partnership has been developed between Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technologies (SIIT) and the university, which will permit students who have completed two years at SIIT to then attend university and complete their degree at the Edwards School of Business. The president thanked Dean Taras for her work on this initiative and noted that this is the beginning of what she hopes is a series of partnerships developed provincially, nationally and internationally.

There were no questions of the president.

#### 6. Report of the Provost

Brett Fairbairn, provost and vice-president academic, noted his written report in the meeting materials and provided additional comments, elaborating on the university budget and what is being done to address the projected deficit. He acknowledged that budget changes are difficult, confusing and upsetting and are not undertaken without soul searching and heartache. Such change creates fears, rumors and speculation and makes people look for alternatives. Although unable to dispel such feelings, Dr. Fairbairn noted he can answer questions and attempt to make the university's budgetary situation more understandable.

Dr. Fairbairn compared the university budget to a personal budget, where revenues are planned to equal or exceed expenses. There currently is no deficit as the university ended 2012/13 with a small surplus. A large amount of this positive variance was due to one-time measures, and expenditures deferred to future years. However, a deficit is forecast as university revenues are not keeping pace with expenditures. If no changes are made, a budget gap will exist before 2016. As of 2013, the projected gap stood at approximately \$29M after accounting for permanent changes and adjustments. Upcoming retirements will help further in 2015 and beyond; but will not fully address the projected deficit. The provost advised that although he does not know in fact what the deficit will be in 2016, based on reasonable projections, the university will face a deficit budget unless substantive changes are made in how things are done.

The provost explained the key drivers in the operating budget and drew Council's attention to the attachment to his written report. Within the university's sources of revenue, the largest source is from provincial funding. Targeted revenue is specifically offset by targeted expenditures, as shown in the report. The university's provincial base operating grant in 2012/13 included a 2.1% increase; in 2013/14, a 2% increase was received. The provost advised that increases greater than 2% are not anticipated within the foreseeable future, due to increased health care costs and infrastructure pressures within the province. In other provinces, post-secondary institutions have seen

provincial budget reductions from year to year. If the university continues to receive 2% increases, the university will be a leader in Canada and therefore the risk of the increase being less than 2% is significant.

The provost advised that other revenue is from tuition fees, which is set based on the principles of comparability, affordability and quality; and therefore is not a highly variable resource. The other major source of revenue is income from investments, which is the most variable source.

Looking at the university's expenses, the largest expense is for compensation and benefits. Compensation is based on comparisons. When we look at other universities, we see that compensation costs rise from year to year based on nominal settlements, and in addition there are changes to increments, merit, benefits and other variables. At other universities these additional factors, beyond nominal rates of settlements, amount to additional 1.5 to 2% increases year over year. This means a nominal increase of 2% results in total compensation costs increasing approximately 4%. There is confidence in these projected numbers, based on information shared by peer institutions.

Regarding pension going concern payments, the provost advised that the pension payments are required by the superintendent of pensions in order to fund our pension plans and long term disability plans. Currently, pension payments amount to \$7.2M annually but this does not include the pension payments in contributions. All of these amounts are being updated given the 2013 year-end amounts. The increases in the budget are based on prudent estimates rather than worst case estimates, so there is some risk in these assumptions. There are also expense increases from utilities, library increases, new building costs and other similar expenditures.

Dr. Fairbairn advised that the university needs to begin dedicating funds to renew its buildings and address deferred maintenance and infrastructure renewal. Although deferrals in this area have assisted on a month to month basis, there are no long-term savings achieved by this strategy.

The provost then spoke of the academic priorities fund (APF) advising that one of the most important allocations from the APF is to increase scholarships to graduate students. He also advised that tuition revenue sharing has been devolved to colleges that have used this amount for student scholarships among other purposes.

The provost explained that his comments articulate the expected revenues that the university can spend as directed by its priorities. There are also special purpose revenues outside the operating budget that fund specific initiatives, such as the Global Institute for Food Security and the Canadian Light Source. These special purpose revenues allow the university to hire more faculty, support more students and build a university that is elevated; but these special funds cannot be redirected to the operating budget.

The provost advised that his description outlines a budget framework, which is utilized by assigning differing plausible values to components to see how the budget picture changes. He also advised that the university's multi-year budget framework will be updated in the next few months and will be made available to the university community.

The provost noted that he and the vice-president, finance and resources, have presented financial information at town halls, within financial reports and on the university website; and also solicited suggestions from deans and leaders. Council is where leaders in the academic community come together to debate and understand the university's financial situation.

There were a number of questions of the provost. A Council member asked whether given that the deficit projections seem to be leading down a road of reduction in salaries and imply faculty job loss, whether one wouldn't first explore all other possible reductions in the budget. Specifically, he asked the provost to explain what has been done to identify other options. The provost advised that suggestions have been solicited from the campus community and ideas for revenue increases and expenditure reductions have been incorporated into the operating budget adjustment (OBA) process. There are steering groups that have received suggestions and continue to do so. All suggestions are on the table and have been looked at from the perspective of how much benefit the idea will bring to university and how practical the idea is to implement. Seven initiatives have been identified; of which TransformUS is one initiative. The others include reviewing: compensation; university spend; procurement practices; shared services; organizational design and revenue generation. The provost advised that administration will continue to accept new suggestions from the university community.

There was a question regarding the TransformUS process and its validity from a non-Council member and whether there was any information related to inappropriate methodology or data that would have dissuaded the provost from following the TransformUS process. The provost advised that budget processes are not statistical in nature but involve combining the weighting of different criteria using thought, judgment and deliberation. In assessing the work done, the Provost indicated he would look at whether it was thoughtful, deliberative, well presented and had information that supported the conclusions.

A question was asked regarding the APF and what it was used for other than to fund graduate students. The provost advised that the fund consists of \$3.5M per year for the third planning cycle and funds will be set aside for the fund in the fourth planning cycle. The fund represents less than 1% of the university's budget. This fund is used to support everything that is funded centrally out of the college and university's integrated plans. Some of the items that have been funded through the APF include: an increase in graduate scholarship funding; funding for the three schools; creation of learning communities for students; and some faculty positions. The provost advised that he would undertake to send a link to the report on the APF.

A student member of Council noted that the provost said he wanted to see students at all levels of the TransformUS process and given that students were on the task forces and have an oversight role on Council, asked why no students are on PCIP and the PCIP advisory committee given its advanced role in the TransformUS process. The provost advised that PCIP is defined as the administration's senior committee for planning and consists of the four vice-presidents enhanced by one dean and the vice-provosts. These are people who have budgetary authority at the university and exercise this authority under the president. PCIP is not a representative body but a management committee. Occasionally some decisions are delegated to PCIP, but mostly it reviews matters and recommends to other bodies. However, the provost advised that he would be interested to have students more involved in TransformUS and is asking for more student feedback. The student asked for assurance that any decisions that would affect students and program cuts would be deferred and not made by PCIP. The provost advised that the substantial decisions go to the Board of Governors but that he would have to think about any of the smaller decisions PCIP might make before being able to provide that assurance.

A Council member spoke to including consultation with department heads, as this intent was signaled in follow-up to the provost's academic address earlier in the week. He noted that there is an impression that the university administration neglected consultation at the department level. The provost advised that the department head leadership forum is an important forum to discuss issues such as the leadership of the university. From PCIP's point of view, the planning units are the colleges under the leadership of the deans; he encouraged department heads to talk to their deans.

A Council member noted that in the provost's approach to the deficit, more money is being asked for than what he thought was necessary, in order to dedicate funding to areas of priority and strength. He asked whether the provost was saying that he was willing to see current faculty members let go at the same time as plans are made to hire new faculty. The provost advised that there will be many changes and both faculty and non-faculty members will be affected. However, creating the opportunity for some reinvestment is strategic to selectively build some areas and was supported in discussion with Council members.

A non-Council member asked whether similar TransformUS processes are expected in future years or whether the TransformUS process will be a one-time event. The provost advised that prioritization informs the budgeting process and that being mindful of how our allocation of resources reflects our priorities needs to be a part of the university planning process. The provost recalled the task force groups were clear in their support of program prioritization as a periodic event, although they noted opportunities to modify the process.

A Council member noted that he was glad with the announcement of the temperature changes in May but asked whether it will affect the quality of research that is sensitive to room temperatures and questioned whether in this instance, the focus was too much on balancing the budget. The provost advised that he would follow-up on this question and agreed that temperature changes cannot be made arbitrarily in research facilities that are sensitive to room temperatures and that he is mindful of not making budget choices on isolated facts. He noted this is one reason why PCIP is working on coordinating decisions.

A non-Council member noted the APF project allocation is approximately \$70M, which must be included in the budget projections to justify the TransformUS process and asked the provost to elaborate on the use of the fund. The provost advised that the APF is not \$70M and is guided by the university's planning priorities and the nature of that planning process is transparent. The plan is one that has been agreed to as a university through our governing bodies and represents the priorities of the university as a whole. The other funds referenced by the questioner included targeted funding for salaries and services in the Colleges of Medicine and Nursing and funds for the renewal of existing university buildings such as the Arts Tower, Murray Building, Biology, and Physics.

## 7. Student Societies

### 7.1 Report from the USSU

Jordan Sherbino, vice-president academic affairs of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union (USSU), presented the report to Council. He focused on two concerns. The first is a proposal for a tuition waiver and financial support for those in foster care in the province to allow them to attend the university. He noted that a handout was available to Council members entitled "Tuition Waiver – Proposal for Action". Mr. Sherbino advised that the USSU has had some positive responses from the government and the university administration and is looking to further this initiative. He asked the university to develop a policy to waive tuition and fees for these students and the government to reconsider its current practice and policy. He stated his belief that these two bodies could begin to work together on this pressing issue to establish this program in the long-term. He noted that the university is autonomous and can determine its own budget and academic programs, but is not separate from the province and that allowing students in foster care to attend is something the university should support.

Secondly, Mr. Sherbino noted the Council motion regarding TransformUs to be considered as a later item. He advised that in January, the University Student's Council unanimously passed a motion of non-confidence in TransformUS based on the Council's belief that students were not included to the extent deemed appropriate. He claimed that as the USSU Council does not have representation on PCIP it therefore does not have influence on financial decisions. Mr. Sherbino asked that Council members keep in mind, when the motion is debated, how the university can best serve students.

## 7.2 Report from the GSA

Ehimai Ohiozebau, president of the Graduate Students' Association (GSA), presented the GSA report to Council focusing on two issues: TransformUS and an update on GSA events.

Regarding TransformUS, Mr. Ohiozebau advised that he needed to ensure that graduate students' interests are known. The task force groups included graduate student involvement. Knowing that students are stakeholders in the process, Mr. Ohiozebau advised that there has been nothing to demonstrate to graduate students that the TransformUS process has not been transparent. While he recognizes that there has not been a consensus on this point, he stated his belief that calling the process not transparent is not true. He expressed the five principles, which have led the GSA to its position:

1. The GSA has expressed reservation with the university increasing personnel costs as greater than \$300M per year goes to personnel costs with very little investment in graduate student awards and scholarships. The GSA has asked for a reduction in personnel costs to allow for enhanced graduate student awards and the task force reports encourage reduction in administrative personnel costs.
2. Across the board cuts would significantly affect the scholarships and stipends that graduate students enjoy.
3. The university administration has advised that the current financial state of the institution will not translate to tuition increases, and the task force reports did not encourage tuition fee increases.
4. The task force reports greatly focused on graduate student and research funding.
5. Two graduate students were on the task force groups and worked for seven months on these. For graduate students time is precious, yet they sacrificed their time and it should be commended by respectful consideration of the task force reports.

Mr. Ohiozebau also noted that it is imperative to add that there are some concerns, which is evident for example in that the GSA Council is today considering a motion to recommend including GSA students in developing the implementation plan. He also noted that the GSA is considering a motion to request to have the student on the Board of Governors alternate so that it is a GSA student every other year.

Secondly, Mr. Ohiozebau noted the Graduate Student Conference that will be held next week and advised that Dr. Alaa Abd-El-Aziz will be the keynote speaker for the gala event. Dr. Abd-El-Aziz is currently the president of the University of Prince Edward Island and obtained his Ph.D. in Chemistry from the University of Saskatchewan. In closing, Mr. Ohiozebau noted that members of the GSA are currently voting on whether they would like to continue to have the UPass.

## 8. Planning and Priorities Committee

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

### 8.1 Item for information: TransformUS Program Prioritization Process and the Task Force Reports

Dr. Walley noted that the report presented to Council by the planning and priorities committee was not released to PCIP; rather the letters appended to the report from each of the Council committees were submitted to PCIP prior to being provided to Council. Dr. Walley noted that in January 2013, Council approved in principle the undertaking of a prioritization process. Dr. Walley quoted from the minutes of the meeting noting that, “A priority ranking of all of its programs...will enable the University to allocate its operating resources...on the basis of priority and will facilitate the operating budget adjustments required...without invoking across-the-board reductions.” At that time, modeling the program prioritization mechanism on that described by Dickeson had already been reported by the president. Council was specifically requested to recognize Council’s statutory authority under *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995*, and to signal that Council’s agreement was essential to the success of the prioritization. Dr. Walley also noted that at that time it was made clear that all resulting academic decisions would come to Council for decision.

Regarding the planning and priorities committee’s report on the task force reports, Dr. Walley advised that the planning and priorities committee requested the other Council committees to provide their perspective on the reports and the TransformUS process from each “committee’s lens”. Council committees are comprised of Council members, GAA members, students and some non-voting resource officers. The letters are not intended to represent the views of Council but rather the views of each individual committee. Dr. Walley noted the actions taken to review the committee, and advised that initially the planning and priorities committee had attempted to summarize the responses of the various committees and then decided to let the committees represent their own views.

Dr. Walley advised that the report of the planning and priorities committee is based on the committee’s own discussion based on what was reviewed. Ultimately, a strong majority of the committee concluded that program prioritization should inform the allocation of resources to programs, which is in keeping with the January 2013 decision of Council. The committee acknowledged that the existing program prioritization process is not without limitations. The report highlights some of these limitations including those associated with data collection, the level of granularity (particularly of the support services report that may have directed attention at individuals rather than units), the lack of clarity regarding the assessment of structure versus function of units, and finally the timeframe in which the process occurred which was viewed by some as putting constraints on providing meaningful feedback to the reports. The report also acknowledges the stress upon faculty, staff and students that the TransformUS process has generated, and continues to generate. Nonetheless, the majority view of the committee holds that the TransformUS reports can be viewed as one component of a decision-making process, which should be supported by further input and assessment – particularly of the complex inter-relationships of programs and support services – before any decisions are made.

Dr. Walley concluded that reviewing our academic programs and support services yields valuable insight and information about the many parts that constitute the whole. As such, the process of program prioritization provides a unique point-in-time campus-wide assessment,

which gives us a place from which to debate the merits of continuing or discontinuing our present array of programs and services that support our academic endeavors.

There were no questions or comments.

9. Motion from Council member Len Findlay

The chair commented on the rarity of motions brought to Council by an individual. The chair noted the process to be followed for the debate on the motion. He advised that 20 to 30 minutes will be given for the debate and that he would then come back and ask Council if it was ready for the question. Preference will be given to Council members, and also to Council members who have not spoken and that each speaker will be limited to two minutes. The chair advised that the mover will introduce the motion and be given an opportunity to speak at the end of the debate.

The following motion was moved and seconded:

FINDLAY/BROOKE: The University Council expresses non-confidence in the TransformUS process as a means of making academic decisions, and Council will therefore continue to rely on existing collegial structures and processes in making such decisions.

Dr. Findlay provided remarks to Council. He noted that being a university we disagree as to what the best is for the university and how to get there. He advised that he was voted to Council on an anti-Dickeson platform and therefore owes it to those who voted for him to speak. Dr. Findlay noted that his department did well in the TransformUS process, and therefore self-interest did not play a part in his submission. Rather, he was making an appeal for collegial action that promotes excellence as diversity and enlightenment, not institutional alignment and financial expediency. Noting that everybody makes mistakes, Dr. Findlay advised that smart people learn from their mistakes and that Council should learn from its mistakes. He believes that Council's two mistakes were to consent "in principle" to an unspecified prioritization process that rapidly became the Dickeson one based on anti-faculty animus from a self-promoting individual. The second of Council's mistakes was showing too little curiosity of the origins and extent of the budgetary deficit.

Dr. Findlay advised that Council now has the opportunity to see TransformUS for what it is, a deeply flawed exercise pursued by hard-working and insightful faculty to the best of their ability and a major waste of time and resources. Council also has the opportunity to see that useful things emerging from TransformUS can be saved for due academic process, lest they remain tainted and hence resisted as products of a process no other member of the U-15 would adopt. Dr. Findlay advised that Council's obligations are to reclaim its reputation for independence; to reflect on the divided response to the USSU president at the last meeting of this body between silent administrators and applauding faculty and students; and to resist the unrelenting Integrated Planning onslaught of the past 11 years, which has increased the burdens of surveillance and reporting that impedes serious, independent and intellectual work.

In conclusion, Dr. Findlay advised that we cannot "audit the future" but we can shape it on the basis of academic excellence and the public interest rather than contrived exigency, selective transparency, and cover for culprits. In order to begin that shaping, Dr. Findlay advised that a motion of non-confidence in TransformUS is necessary, lest faculty and student morale sink even lower while PCIP cuts needlessly or opportunistically.

The chair invited debate. A Council member introduced a motion to divide the compound motion because in his view the second part of the motion did not follow the first part as TransformUS was

never something that would supersede Council processes so as worded, the motion presented a false dichotomy.

RIGBY/DOBSON: That the motion moved by Dr. Findlay be divided into the following two parts:

- (i) The University Council expresses non-confidence in the TransformUS process as a means of making academic decisions.
- (ii) Council will continue to rely on existing collegial structures and processes in making academic decisions.

The chair called a brief recess and conferred with the university secretary. The university secretary informed Council that the motion was neither debatable nor amendable and that the chair is to rule on whether the two parts can stand on their own. The chair's ruling is that the second part cannot stand on its own as a valid motion because it is moot. University Council is required under *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995*, to rely on existing collegial structures and processes in making academic decisions so there is no reason to have this motion. As the first clause can stand on its own but the second clause cannot stand on its own, the motion cannot be split into two independent clauses.

In response, a Council member asked whether the last clause could be deleted. The university secretary confirmed that it could but this would be an amendment to the motion and would have to be approved by Council. The following motion for amendment was then made and seconded:

MAKAROVA/OVSENEK: That the motion be amended to read as follows: The University Council expresses non-confidence in the TransformUS process as a means of making academic decisions.

The chair invited the mover to speak to the amendment. The mover noted that the second part of the original motion was redundant so the amended motion would express the intent of the motion adequately.

Dr. Findlay, as the mover of the original motion, was given an opportunity to respond. Dr. Findlay noted that he was complying with the instructions for constructing a motion to Council that there should be an action identified that would ensue from the motion, so he had added the second part to show what would happen if the motion of non-confidence was carried. He noted that the second part supported the sentiment that if the university does not go with TransformUS, life will go on and perhaps in a better manner than today.

A Council member asked for clarification regarding the procedural motion to amend the substantive motion. The university secretary clarified that Council is not being asked to vote on the amended motion, but to vote on whether Council agrees that the motion should be amended. The question was then called on the amendment and CARRIED.

The chair then opened debate on the amended motion. A number of Council and non-Council members spoke in favor of the motion and a number of Council members spoke against the motion. Council members speaking in favour of the motion provided the following comments: that administration has been stating alarmist facts to support following the TransformUS process and the Dickeson model; encouraged Council to take back the authority for academic decisions; that the preliminary results of the rankings were based on crude and flawed data and therefore provided many reasons to distrust this process; the cost of the TransformUS process is the impact on programs, discipline and loss of faculty positions and there was no guarantee that any of these positions would be replaced by tenure-track faculty; one of the responsibilities of the university

was to consider including the knowledge that the future generation will need and this process does not do that; and the collective knowledge on campus requires Council to stand against this process.

A non-Council member noted the open letter that had been sent to the president originally with 100 signatures, and claimed that it now had 350 signatures. He noted that it expressed concern with TransformUS and the reasons why, including its: non-academic nature, non-peer review, damage of morale, and a predicted cause of decreased enrolment. He believed the letter was brushed off by administration and a condescending answer provided by the provost largely stating that the letter was based on misconceptions. Although the templates asked how the programs aligned with the university priorities, no one really knew what to align to and this illustrated that priorities were set by the task force groups.

A Council member spoke against the motion advising that when she was at the University of Calgary she was informed of a roll back of 5% due to across-the-board budget reductions even before she began work and thereafter 20% cuts over a number of years with other colleagues in Alberta experiencing similar reductions. She stated she would rather have program prioritization than a boom bust cycle. She expressed that all individuals were given the opportunity to present their programs in the best way they could. She noted that change is hard and there is no perfect process but that she would far rather live through this change process than what she endured in Alberta.

Another Council member spoke against the motion noting that in his experience this process has been one of the most open, transparent and ground-up processes that he has seen in the past 25 years. He urged Council to engage, participate, embrace and not overlook the opportunity to participate in this process.

A graduate student Council member spoke against the motion for the reason that if the motion was passed it could stall the efforts to reduce the budget through the TransformUS process and that may cause administration to want to increase tuition. Instead, he called for Council to critically review the implementation plan when it comes. The Council member asked whether he could give someone his proxy for this vote and the chair advised that he has ruled no proxies will be allowed.

A non-Council member spoke in favour of the motion largely based on reviewing the paper posted on VOX by Dr. Eric Howe whose view was that although the process was fine, the template was fundamentally flawed as the purpose of the template was to elicit information to target 20% of the workforce. The individual encouraged administration to slow down, as there was no academic problem in terms of cutting positions. He concluded by saying that the process has to be looked at in a sophisticated manner and not one that is superficial.

A Council member advised that she opposed the motion as hard work has been done by a lot of people and although it is not a perfect process she also had an experience of working in an organization where one-third of the work force disappeared with no input from the front line. The Council member encouraged other members to view the discussion as part of a dialogue, to acknowledge the work done today, and to move the discussion forward.

A non-Council member then spoke in favor of the motion. He quoted s. 4(1) of *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995*, "The primary role of the university is to provide post-secondary instruction and research in the humanities, sciences, social sciences and other areas of human intellectual, cultural, social and physical development." He cautioned that if TransformUS goes through many of the programs across the university will be lost, which needs to be made clear as what is likely to happen unless this motion is supported. He noted that if it was only the University Council that was voting on the program decisions and the usual democratic process was followed, he would not be as concerned; however, the problem is that the recommendations will go to PCIP.

He concluded by indicating that although he has searched through the Act he has not found any reference to PCIP, and therefore academic decisions going to PCIP are *ultra vires* (beyond the law).

A Council member and chair of the academic programs committee spoke against the motion for the reason that Council controls the process for program termination and everything has to come to Council for approval. According to the program termination process, requests to discontinue programs can be brought forward by the president or the provost, and voting for the motion will not prevent this from happening. Despite any flaws in the TransformUS process, it is only one step in a much broader process.

A Council member spoke against the motion advising that the alternatives to the TransformUS process are not advantageous, based on his own experience in Colorado when the reduction in state funding resulted in a moderately priced program transforming into a program with an operating budget supported almost entirely by student-derived revenue.

The provost spoke about PCIP and its work in the coming months. The authority for PCIP derives from the president's authority and that of the Board as provided under *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995*. PCIP's role in this process is to identify how to reduce the operating budget by 5%. Because of the magnitude that administrative services and academic programs will be affected, a plan is required, which PCIP is tasked to develop. The plan will present recommendations directed to the decision-makers of the university including its governing bodies, where the recommendations will be debated and considered on their merits. The provost advised that he would like to work with Council in developing those proposals and that Council's perspective matters very much to him. The question facing Council today is whether PCIP should take into account the task force reports or disregard the reports and use another basis. The provost advised that he finds the reports to be well written and thoughtful recommendations based on the best cases put forward, and that therefore it makes sense to pay attention to the work of the task forces.

A Council member supporting the motion advised that Council will be required to consider recommendations from PCIP in the name of a financial crisis claimed by the senior administration that is off base. Arguments from senior administration have been that the only way forward is to cut programs and therefore costs. However the analysis of costs of programs in the academic report reveals that discontinuing the 95 programs in quintile five only accounts for 3% of financial resources, and therefore the only way to cut costs in a substantial way is to cut faculty salaries and that can be accomplished only by laying off faculty or not replacing faculty upon retirement, which is a phenomenon currently occurring with the incentivized retirement scheme that is not in accordance with university processes. He called for the track record at other institutions using the Dickeson process to be reviewed, such as the University of Guelph, where he claimed that the process was not followed through. Given the gravity of the decisions, the member suggested that the standard of evidence has to be at a higher level and suggested that PCIP has not proven that beyond a standard of doubt. He asked whether Council has confidence in the TransformUS process without a doubt.

A Council member and co-chair of the academic task force spoke against the motion stating that TransformUS was a collegial process with colleagues putting in hundreds of hours of work. She advised she has never seen a group of people trying as hard because they believed it would make this university a better place. She emphasized that the task force made no decisions but rather provided recommendations to be considered by PCIP and other decision-makers, to provide an implementation plan that Council has not yet seen. She stated that Council has the ability to vote on program changes. Regarding students, the member advised that the task force was very concerned about students and identified those programs within which students are not achieving the intended

outcomes and called for Council to consider its responsibility to address this condition, apart from any budgetary concerns.

A Council member spoke against the motion noting that he welcomed this discussion, as he believes it comes at a good time in the history and stage of this institution. He advised that despite the drawbacks of the TransformUS process as presented today, the budget challenge still exists. If the motion succeeds, Council will need to explain to the public and students why more time and resources are required to develop a new process and that the TransformUS process was inadequate despite having input from faculty, students and administration. A number of processes that we oppose that have been followed elsewhere have not been followed here. The Council member asked whether we are mature enough as an institution to work together and indicated that he would argue that we are for the benefit of students.

A non-Council member spoke in favor of the motion advising that she did not have a problem with administration ranking the programs but rather she had a problem with a ranking that factors into an assessment, whereby 26% of the weighting is on quality. She questioned why a university would look at a budget-based review over a peer review based on merit and noted the university has existing systems that look at quality by peer review. She advised that the TransformUS process lacks validity, as the templates did not capture the quality of the programs. To have validity, any process designed to meet budgetary reductions through program elimination should be based on the merit of the program.

A graduate student and non-Council member spoke in favor of the motion suggesting that a non-confidence vote in TransformUS does not mean the university must engage in across-the-board cuts but rather that we need to reevaluate the process and model. Individuals do not agree where our university will be in the future.

A Council member speaking in favor of the motion advised that he has been gratified to learn that we have a kinder and gentler process to remove programs rather than the TransformUS process. He suggested that engaging with the TransformUS process means losing sight of the implications of the process to the scholars who have accepted to work at the university and have met the standards put before them year after year. He noted that most people know that the termination of a faculty position is the termination of a faculty career and advised that all other options should be explored, which has not been done.

A Council member spoke against the motion advising that the Division of Humanities and Fine Arts through the incentivized retirements program will lose roughly 5% to 10% of its faculty. The division now needs to recast its programs to be able to continue to offer excellent programs across the fine arts and this is our challenge and we have a reference point which is the Academic Task Force report. This is a document that we are using today. He noted that he does not normally read about non-confidence in a process but rather in a government and therefore did not perceive that a non-confidence motion would pertain to Council's function.

A Council member spoke against the motion advising that as a scientist he has not been provided with a statement which justifies the belief in the falseness of the TransformUS process.

A Council member spoke against this motion for the reason that it is a better process than many of the other options as has already been noted by many others. The rankings from the process provide background information to help inform decisions. When speaking with faculty one of the comments she has heard is that every organization needs to look at its total operations occasionally, and that this is a valid and appropriate exercise for the university to undertake at this time.

A Council member and a member of one of the Task Forces the noted that during the debate he had heard almost nothing that he disagreed with but observed there is a “disconnect” regarding the intent of TransformUS. He stated that the TransformUS process is over and that it ended when the task force reports were delivered. The process at this stage is a collegial process regarding who we are and how we focus our resources. He noted that he has been on Council a long time and Council is being asked to answer the question it has been asked many times previously and has not answered of “what are we not going to do.” He advised that individuals on the Task Force groups would not have participated if their recommendations all resulted in direct decisions. He concluded by stating that he planned to vote against the motion due to his belief that there is a misunderstanding of the TransformUS process.

A Council member and a member of one of the Task Forces advised that the number of hours diligently spent were not flawed. He expressed his belief that the process was a sound qualitative and quantitative process, and that where there was not enough information, further information was sought. As in his view the process was not flawed, he advised he intended to vote against the motion.

At this point in the debate the chair stated that Council had spent 45 minutes debating the motion and noted that before he called for the question he would ask Dr. Findlay to speak again.

A non-Council member suggested that those Council members that worked on the Task Forces should be excluded from the vote due to the large investment they made in the process and as a result they have a stake in the outcome of the motion.

A number of members of Council called for the question. The chair invited Dr. Findlay to provide his closing remarks. Dr. Findlay suggested that 11 years of integrated planning have resulted in forced compliance rather than beneficial outcomes – power not product – and therefore there is no reason to believe that this shift to prioritization will be any different. He also suggested that the bureaucratic euphoria emanating from senior administration is radically at variance with the recent and current experience with faculty, students and support staff. Dr. Findlay concluded that under both scenarios the claim that the university will emerge “leaner but stronger” from TransformUS is an insult to our intelligence and a denial of our history and current capacity. He asked Council members to not be afraid and to support the motion.

A Council member suggested that in the interest of harmony a written ballot be used.

WALDRAM/SOLOSE: That the vote on this motion be undertaken as a written motion and recorded in the minutes.

DEFEATED

The amended motion was then voted on by a show of hands. The motion was DEFEATED by a vote of 18 in favor and 42 opposed.

#### 10. Academic Programs Committee

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

10.1 Request for Decision: College of Graduate Studies and Research: Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner option) and Postgraduate Degree Specialization Certificate: Nurse Practitioner – change to admission qualifications

Professor Dobson noted that the nurse practitioner option was described in the written materials. He summarized the primary changes for the nurse practitioner option and the postgraduate degree specialization certificate.

DOBSON/WALLEY: That Council approve the changes in admission qualifications for the Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner Option) and the Postgraduate Degree Specialization Certificate: Nurse Practitioner from the College of Graduate Studies and Research, effective September 2014.

CARRIED

10.2 Item for Information: Fall Mid-Term Break in November, 2014

Professor Dobson noted that the committee's consideration and approval of the revisions to the Academic Calendar to provide a fall break has already been released. There were no questions.

10.3 Item for Information: 2014-15 Admissions Template Update Report

Professor Dobson noted that this annual report was provided for information of Council.

11. Teaching, Learning and Academic Resources Committee

11.1 Item for Information: Experiential Learning Concept Paper

Professor Aaron Phoenix, chair of the teaching, learning and academic resources committee, asked that this item be postponed until the next meeting to which the chair agreed.

12. International Activities Committee

12.1 Item for Information: Semi-annual Report to Council for 2013-14

Professor Gap Soo Chang, chair of the international activities committee, presented the report. The report consists of a summary of the activities of the committee to date this year. The committee has spent much time discussing establishing international research and learning metrics to be able to identify whether university goals are being achieved. He advised that it is very urgent to enhance recognition of the university globally and improve its international rankings. He invited comments and advised that the committee would welcome feedback.

13. Other business

There was no other business.

14. Question period

There were no questions.

15. Adjournment

In closing the chair noted the ongoing Council elections, encouraged Council members to vote, and asked members to also encourage their colleagues to vote.

DOBSON/PARKINSON: That the meeting be adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

CARRIED

Next meeting – 2:30 pm, March 20, 2014