

Minutes of University Council
2:30 p.m., Thursday, April 17, 2008
Neatby-Timlin Theatre

Attendance: See Appendix A.

1. Opening Remarks

Condolences were expressed on behalf of Council by Professor Emeritus Murray Scharf, who paid tribute to his former colleague in the College of Education, Professor Edgar Wallace (Wally) Stinson. With the amalgamation of the U of S and the Teachers' Colleges in 1964, Professor Stinson became an Associate Professor of Curriculum Studies in the College of Education, later becoming Director of Student Teaching. He retired in 1978 and passed away March 20, 2008.

Following a moment of silence, the business of Council resumed.

Chair Claire Card opened the meeting with an acknowledgement to Council that she has assumed a position as Chair with significant legacy issues, a fact which has required her to ask the Vice Chair on several occasions to preside at meetings so that she could participate in the debate. She asserted that her view of leadership does not always include neutrality, and she served notice that it is her intention as Chair occasionally to take a position that will require her to step away from the Chair. She reminded Council that she has spoken up publicly on the matter before Council today; in order to avoid any pretense of neutrality on this matter, she has asked Dr. Ziola to take over as Chair for Item 2, adoption of the agenda, and Item 8, approval of the Integrated Plan.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Professor Card relinquished the Chair at this point, inviting Professor Ziola to preside. Professor Tymchatyn rose on a point of order, indicating that he and Professor Card had submitted a written Notice of Motion which he submitted on or about April 4, and which does not appear on the agenda. He asked the Chair to explain the absence of this item on the agenda.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Rigby spoke on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, indicating that the Committee had determined that the motion as presented does not fall within the purview of Council. Professor Tymchatyn objected that the Coordinating Committee does not have the authority to rule on whether a Notice of Motion should come forward to Council, but has only the authority to decide whether such a motion has been properly presented. Since this item relates to Item 8 on the agenda and was provided to Council on time, it should be on the agenda. It is his contention that only Council may decide what is the business of Council, and that this authority is conferred by the *University of Saskatchewan Act*, Sections 61a, o and v.

The Chair ruled that the Coordinating Committee having removed the notice of motion from the agenda materials, members of Council have not had the opportunity to see the motion prior to this meeting. The ruling was challenged by Professor Tymchatyn, whereupon the Chair explained his reasons for the decision and put the matter to a vote in order to resolve the issue. The ruling of the Chair was upheld by a majority of those present.

Professor Tymchatyn then sought to have a motion added to the agenda, as follows: “Therefore it is moved that the Human Resources Strategic Plan be withdrawn and replaced with a scholarly plan based on the goal of achieving and maintaining an academic culture of excellence at the University of Saskatchewan that is prepared with the recognition of the public nature of the University, its leading role in the community, its commitment to academic excellence in all its practices, policies and procedures, and in collaboration with the full University Community.”

TYMCHATYN/CARD: To add the motion as read to the agenda as Item 8.

DEFEATED

ANGEL/KALRA: That the agenda be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

Professor Card then returned to the Chair.

3. Minutes of the meeting of March 20, 2008

ZIOLA/RICHARDSON: That the minutes of the meeting of March 20, 2008 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the President

In President MacKinnon’s absence, Acting Provost Ernie Barber agreed to respond to any questions; no questions were raised.

6. Student Society Reports

6.1 Report of the USSU

USSU Academic Vice President Josie Steeves commended Council to her written report. Members of Council expressed congratulations to Ms. Steeves on having been elected as President for the coming academic year, as well as compliments to the USSU for having established the practice of submitting a written report to Council each month.

6.2 Report of the GSA

There was no report from the GSA.

7. Report of the Acting Provost

Dr. Barber referred Council members to his written report, drawing their attention particularly to the announcement the new Provost's Awards and Provost's Project Grant in Innovative Practices in Teaching and Learning.

8. University of Saskatchewan Second Integrated Plan 2008/09 – 2011/12

Dr. Ziola assumed the Chair again at this point and invited Professor John Rigby to present the report of the College Plans Review Committee.

8.1 College Plans Review Committee comments on the Second Integrated Plan

Professor Rigby presented the report for information. In introducing the report, he began with a rebuttal on behalf of the College Plans Review Committee (CPRC) to the view that any of the unit plans should be rejected because they are not scholarly documents and did not receive an academic review, and also to the suggestion that the Integrated Plan is deeply coloured by the Human Resources plan. On the first point, he suggested that a more appropriate question than whether the plans received an academic review would be whether the plans received an appropriate and thorough review. Citing the steps that were taken by CPRC, he argued that the plans had indeed been subject to careful and adequate review. On the latter point, Professor Rigby commented on the evaluation of and response to the Human Resources plan by CPRC, and on the place that the college and unit plans have in relation to the University's overall plan. He pointed out that the Integrated Plan does not draw heavily on any single unit or college plan, but rather on the common analytical framework that underlies them and on the *Common Messages and Issues* report written by CPRC itself. He asked Council to lay aside a focus on one particular unit plan and instead to focus its attention to consideration of the Integrated Plan as presented in the agenda materials, inviting members to do so in the knowledge that the process of review leading to today's meeting has been "open, robust and appropriate."

Professor Rigby then called members' attention to the committee's written report, which outlines the process by which the plans were reviewed and the draft document was developed. He noted that what is being approved is an overall structure and direction, confirming that there will be ongoing 'fine tuning' as the report moves to implementation.

8.2 Approval of the Second Integrated Plan as a Framework for Action

The Chair then invited Acting Provost Barber to present the University's Second Integrated Plan.

Professor Barber led Council members through the background of the planning context, the accomplishments of the first planning period, and the milestones that have been reached to date in the current planning cycle. He also spoke of commitments that the institution is making as part of the current plan.

With respect to the relationship between the overall Integrated Plan and the unit plans, he suggested that today's approval of an institutional plan will in turn require all units to revisit their individual plans and consider ways in which they might need to adjust to working together to implement the overall plan. In concluding, he expressed confidence that this is a plan which empowers all individuals and units within the university community.

BARBER/RIGBY: That Council approve the University of Saskatchewan Second Integrated Plan as a framework for action for the second planning cycle, 2008/09 to 2011/12.

The Chair then invited discussion of the motion.

Professor Card asked that her remarks be recorded for the minutes. She commented that her earlier remarks were not meant as a criticism of CPRC, which she acknowledged has worked very hard to perform their mandate as they understood it. She noted that today marks only the second time that the University has embarked on this planning process, and it is not yet a perfect process. She expressed her belief that even a managerial plan requires a solid theoretical foundation, and proposed an amendment to the main motion.

CARD/ TYMCHATYN: That the main motion be amended by adding the following: "That Human resources works alongside campus stakeholders to facilitate the creation of a more cooperative and trust-based campus environment and will provide support for the key tasks of the University rather than positioning themselves as drivers of the University's future directions."

The Provost objected to the amendment on the grounds that the plan itself is what Council has before it for approval, and not all of the unit plans. He pointed out that when the motion to approve the Integrated Plan goes forward to the Board of Governors, the Board will have seen only the Integrated Plan and not all of the unit plans.

A member of Council expressed concern that the language of implementation seems to have replaced the language of development in the new version, and also wondered whether it was clear who "we" refers to on p. 27: who will need to report, and to whom?

A visitor to Council who identified himself as a former member of Council who has taught planning and management echoed Professor Card's assurances that he and his colleagues are not trying to be critical of the way that Council and its committees have worked, but repeated that they are deeply critical of the Human Resources plan for its reliance on the work of Jim Collins. He asked Council members to be wary of Collins' work, which he claimed has been discredited in the U.S. corporate sector. He also suggested that adherence to this plan would lead to the application of U.S. corporate methods in the University's approach to human resources.

Professor Rigby responded with another call to Council to focus on the larger plan rather than individual unit plans; nevertheless he offered his own perspective as a faculty member in the Department of Management and Marketing on the critique of Jim Collins. He suggested that to say that Collins' work has been widely discredited is an overstatement. He asked Council members to take a look at what the Human Resources Plan actually sets out as its goals, which in essence are to recruit and retain highly qualified faculty and staff, give them the tools to be successful, and then reward them when they are successful.

The Chair then called for a vote on the amendment. The amendment was DEFEATED

Another visitor to Council conceded that approval of the plan is likely the appropriate action to take, but suggested that Council must be clear that what they are supporting is the basic architecture and not the detail, which contains a number of serious flaws. To illustrate, he cited p. 19, "We can no longer afford, if we ever could, fragmented, isolated or individual action," and asked what the implications of such a statement might be for academic freedom and the ability to work as an individual researcher pursuing independent enquiry.

Another visitor to Council who identified himself as representing students in residence said that he was pleased with the emphasis on creating more student housing but would like to see more emphasis on renovations to existing residences, including bringing buildings up to LEEDS environmental standards such as retrofitting them with low energy lighting and energy efficient windows. He noted that the government provides grants for such projects.

Professor Fairbairn indicated that on July 1 he will take over from Dr. Barber as Provost and Vice President Academic, and if Council approves this plan, then its implementation will become his responsibility. He commended Professor Barber for the energy, vision and imagination he has contributed to the planning initiative, and for leading the process in a way that recognizes that this is not the Provost's plan, but everyone's plan. He assured Council that he too has been active in the discussions surrounding this plan and that its priority areas and imperatives reflect his own preoccupations and goals. He expressed confidence that this plan provides a breadth and depth that will allow all units to find their own ways to contribute. He expressed his intention of implementing the plan's initiatives in a collaborative fashion, and assured Council that there will be resources available through the

Academic Priorities Fund in support of these commitments. He also reminded members that the plan encourages colleges, departments, and individuals to develop complementary initiatives and plans. The theme of 'working together,' he suggested, carries a strong sense of personal and unit accountability and responsibility, and underlines that our institutional aspirations are interdependent. He feels that the plan before Council today captures vision in an exceptional way.

The Chair then returned to the main motion. The main motion was CARRIED

Dr. Barber spoke a few words of thanks to those who participated and particularly to Pauline Melis, Director of Institutional Planning, who has been the one person most involved in the process from beginning to end. He also thanked members of the Integrated Planning Office and the College Plans Reviews Committee, those who submitted college and unit plans, and all those who offered suggestions and critiques. Finally, he acknowledged both former Provost Michael Atkinson and incoming Provost Brett Fairbairn for their significant contributions to this plan and to the process.

9. Planning and Priorities Committee Report

Professor Card then returned to the Chair.

9.1 Update on the Multi-Year Operating Budget Framework 2008/09 – 2011/12

Professor Rigby presented this report for information. He indicated that the Committee has met with the Director of Budget Planning and will bring a full report back to Council in May.

9.2 Approval of the Interdisciplinary Centre for Culture and Creativity (ICCC)

There was discussion of the extent to which the approval is an empty 'shell' and may exist in name only. Associate Dean Peter Stoicheff indicated that there is a need for an administrative structure in which an interdisciplinary program, if initiated, could be implemented and thrive.

The Chair then called for quorum. Quorum having been lost, the motion on this item was not put forward, but will appear on next month's Council agenda.

Council agreed to proceed informally with the remainder of the agenda.

10. Academic Programs Committee Report

10.1 College of Graduate Studies & Research: MSc and PhD in Health Sciences

There was a brief discussion of this item; the motion will be deferred to next month's agenda.

A concern was expressed regarding the title of the area of specialization by a member of the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition who also teaches in the Colleges of Kinesiology and Veterinary Medicine. The member pointed out that there are already existing graduate programs in the health sciences, and suggested that the degree under consideration would more properly be called the MSc and PhD in Clinical Health Sciences. It was pointed out by another member that this question had already been posed and that a reply was provided on p. 94 of the agenda materials.

11. Nominations Committee Report

11.1 Search Committee for the Dean of Veterinary Medicine

This item was deferred until the next meeting.

12. Coordinating Committee Report

12.1 Memorial Tributes

This item was deferred until the next meeting.

13. Adjournment and next meeting:

The remaining members called for adjournment at 4:20 p.m.
Next meeting is at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 15, 2008 in St. Thomas More Auditorium.