

September 16, 1996

The Honourable Robert Mitchell, Q.C.
Minister of Post-Secondary
Education and Skills Training
335 Legislative Buildings
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B3

Dear Mr. Minister:

On March 22, 1996 you appointed me to act as your Special Representative to facilitate discussions between the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina to better ensure that Saskatchewan's university sector will, on a cost-effective and sustainable basis, continue to provide the Saskatchewan public with relevant, high quality services. You asked me to initiate a dialogue between the universities with the objective of establishing a longer-term process or processes to achieve university revitalization. Finally you asked that I report to you on the conceptual proposals made by the universities, identify any constraints to the renewal process, and offer any additional commentary which I thought pertinent to the future well-being of the university sector in Saskatchewan.

INTRODUCTION

The Terms of Reference emphasized that the universities, throughout the process, were to have the primary role in identifying issues, opportunities, problems and possible solutions. In the discussions which have taken place, that premise has been fully respected.

In this report I will provide you with a description of the issues and ideas which the universities have raised. They include, in some instances, specific proposals for enhanced collaboration between the universities and with the Saskatchewan public, as represented by its government. In respect of each such proposal this report identifies the essential nature of the university proposal and the context in which it is presented. In addition I have provided you with additional comment on the implications of many of the proposals from my perspective, as facilitator of the process.

This report also reviews certain matters which were discussed but in respect of which no university proposal has been made. In respect of those issues I have attempted to outline the themes of the discussion which took place and, where I have thought it appropriate, I have identified future matters for consideration by the government and the universities. Finally, I have identified some of the key issues which the universities and the government, as the provider of funds and custodian of the public interest, may have to address in the years ahead as the university agenda unfolds.

It may be appropriate for me to add a modest disclaimer before proceeding further. I am not, and never have been, a full-time member of the university community. Some have suggested that it would have been more appropriate to have an academic, steeped in the culture of the university, facilitate the discussion. While not an academic, I think that I can fairly claim to be a person with a considerable empathy for the continuing worth of higher education at the university level and an awareness of the stresses which fiscal pressures have placed on the institutions. As an alumnus of the University of Saskatchewan and a former part-time lecturer at the University of Regina, I certainly approached my task with a sympathetic ear to the needs of the institutions and those who work and study within them, as well as the sometimes divergent perspectives of the public. As a member of that public I too have a vested interest in the vitality of the two universities which I hope will be able to provide the same climate of excitement and challenge to my grandchild that I experienced as a student in Saskatoon in 1957. It is in that spirit that I have gone about my work.

One further framework comment may be in order. In March, 1993 the University Program Review Panel, chaired by Dr. A. W. Johnson, delivered its report entitled "Looking at Saskatchewan Universities: Programs, Governance, and Goals" (the "Johnson Report"). That Report dealt in broad strokes with the issues facing Saskatchewan's universities and made a number of recommendations. The work in which I have been engaged did not retrace the ground covered by the Johnson Report, but rather, using it as one important input, examined in greater detail concrete action which might be taken towards the achievement of the goals outlined in that Report—accessibility, excellence and accountability. As one of the participants in our discussions observed, the facilitation process marked the beginning of an implementation phase of the broad scale work recommended in the Johnson Report.

THE FACILITATION PROCESS

I have now completed an extensive series of meetings with the universities directed to the objectives described in my Terms of Reference. Early in the course of our work we determined that it would be desirable to more clearly articulate the goals of our discussions. As agreed with the Presidents they are as set forth below:

General Objectives:

- A. Generally, to provide for a dialogue between the Presidents of the two universities and representatives of the government with a view to establishing a basis for cooperation between the two universities, financial savings and/or improved service delivery, all in a manner fully consistent with university autonomy.
- B. Specifically:
 - (a) In respect of administrative matters, to identify areas of cooperation which might lead to financial savings and/or better service delivery in the near to medium term.

- (b) In respect of academic matters and program development, (i) to ensure that the two universities and the government have a common understanding of the processes by which the two universities will take decisions in academic matters, the time frames and milestones for decisions, and the principles which are employed in those decisions, as each institution engages its academic decision-making process, and (ii) to identify an ongoing process by which major changes proposed from time to time at each university can be subject, where appropriate, to discussion with the other institution (in respect of matters of common interest or potential overlap) and/or the government (in respect of matters of major public importance).
- (c) To identify any impediments to the implementation by each university of administrative collaboration or significant program developments.
- (d) To enhance a spirit of ongoing cooperation between the two universities in serving the needs of the Saskatchewan public.

I draw your particular attention to the fact that the objectives did not include the identification of specific program changes. As a result this report contains no recommendations for particular program changes through the closure or elimination of particular colleges, faculties, specializations or courses.

You will recall that the Presidents of both universities made it clear on their respective campuses that, in their opinion, significant program changes will have to be considered in order to meet the fiscal challenges and preserve the essential quality of the universities. However, the Presidents had no mandate to present proposals in closed-door meetings in respect of specific program changes which would be the subject of on-campus discussions beginning in the fall of 1996. In respect of program matters, therefore, our agreed objective was to identify a framework for future collaboration, where appropriate, between the universities and, as well, with the government.

The challenge for both universities now will be to develop their program changes in a fashion which will, among other things, address any legitimate public concern in respect of (a) the duplication of programs or functions, (b) the perceived lack of cooperation between the two universities, and (c) the ability of the universities to respond to the current internal and external challenges.

They must reposition themselves.

REPORT OVERVIEW AND SUPPORTING ATTACHMENTS

As a result of our discussions, the universities have presented a series of proposals for the consideration of the government. They are responsive to the issues raised in the Terms of Reference and to other pressing concerns, as identified by the universities themselves. For completeness and for ease of reference I have attached these university proposals, together with certain other relevant data, as appendices to this report.

Appendices

In particular the following appendices are attached:

- Appendix A - University Overview
- Appendix B - Funding Data
- Appendix C - Existing University Academic and Research Collaboration
- Appendix D - Administrative Collaboration Proposal
- Appendix E - Procurement Proposal
- Appendix F - Library Proposal
- Appendix G - Technology Proposal
- Appendix H - Fibre Optics Telecommunications Link Proposal
- Appendix I - Program Coordination Proposal
- Appendix J - Renewal Capital Proposal
- Appendix K - Faculty Demographics
- Appendix L - Cooperative Alliances Outside Saskatchewan
- Appendix M - Administrative Costs

Appendices C through K and Appendix M are joint university presentations.

Overview

During the course of the discussions the universities have submitted a number of written proposals and have also reached agreement in respect of certain other matters.

The universities point out that there has been a substantial amount of collaboration between them, in both administrative and program matters. As a consequence of our discussions, they have proposed certain additional initiatives:

1. A general administrative functions review has been commenced and a number of areas have been identified for further collaboration, the development of centres of expertise and new initiatives (pages 35 to 37 and Appendix D).
2. The universities have agreed that intensified joint procurement activities would be advantageous and are initiating a process to determine the most appropriate mechanism (pages 37 to 40 and Appendix E).

3. The universities believe that the maintenance of the strength of their libraries is vital and have advanced a number of ideas for library upgrading and intensified cooperation (pages 40 to 42 and Appendix F).
4. Universities are knowledge-based institutions and enterprises with extensive administrative systems. The effective use of sophisticated technology will lie at the heart of the successful university of the next century. The universities have presented a number of proposals (pages 42 to 46 and Appendix G).
5. A fibre optics telecommunications link to connect the two universities has been identified as a critical element to enhance collaboration in academic and administrative matters, and proposals have been made (pages 46 to 47 and Appendix H).
6. In order to enhance program coordination in a period of scarce resources, the universities propose that an Inter-University Council and a University Coordinating Committee be established (pages 52 to 54 and Appendix I).
7. To ensure sound ongoing communications between the universities and the government and to better permit the universities to be of service to the province, the universities propose the creation of a Cabinet-Universities Consultation Committee (pages 55 to 56 and Appendix I).

In addition, progress has been made in a number of other respects:

1. The universities have emphasized the critical importance of a mechanism to better determine and assure sustained renewal capital needs and have made a proposal (pages 59 to 62 and Appendix J).
2. The universities jointly request that the block funding formula, which determines the split of the provincial operating grant to the two institutions, should be reviewed to ensure its continued relevance and equity (pages 62 to 64).
3. The universities agree that faculty renewal is essential to university renewal on both campuses. The universities are finalizing proposals in respect of early retirement plans (pages 64 to 67).

In addition, the universities will be pursuing possible opportunities for intensified joint efforts in their extension programs (page 68), in distance education (pages 68 to 69) and in international student recruitment (pages 69 to 71).

In my opinion the suggestions made by the universities, if implemented, will go some way toward the goals outlined in the Terms of Reference. They will not, however, be sufficient. At a time of fiscal restraint, the universities will also have to effectively refine their individual missions and act decisively to use the available scarce resources to enhance their strengths. That will almost certainly lead to a reduction in certain activities of the universities.

If wise decisions in respect of programs are made, the universities will be repositioned to build upon their strengths in the future. In effect, by decisive action now, the universities and their faculties and students will be able to confidently predict that there will be fully adequate funding in the future to achieve excellence in education, research and community service.

You asked, in the Terms of Reference, that I endeavour to identify the barriers to effective renewal. Those issues are discussed throughout the report and are summarized on pages 72 to 79.

A fundamental question is whether the university communities, collectively, have the wisdom and courage to act decisively in the interests of the universities to address the constraints or whether they will try to make do with half-hearted measures or, worse still, pursue self-serving goals. In this report I express cautious optimism that they will act effectively for the common good, notwithstanding (or perhaps in part because of) the collegial governance structures which prevail at both institutions. If for some reason the constraints immobilize the universities, then your government will have to consider intervention in the public interest. As I have outlined in this report, such action should be avoided, if possible, not only because it would be inconsistent with the traditional concept of university autonomy (which has been practised successfully in Saskatchewan) but also because the universities know their businesses better than government. As a result, they are in the best position to take the necessary corrective action.

For the universities to succeed, they must maintain the support of the Saskatchewan public. At present, although by far the greatest part of the universities' operating expenditures are funded from provincial resources, there are few effective formal reporting structures. In this report I recommend that the annual reports which the universities deliver to the Legislative Assembly should be a vehicle for a more effective two-way dialogue between the universities, on the one hand, and the government and the Saskatchewan public, on the other. Through a more disciplined annual reporting procedure, the universities may account more appropriately for the funds which they are given. In addition, they will be able to better communicate with the public in respect of their missions and the progress they are making in their teaching, research and community service functions.

In order that Saskatchewan may achieve the greatest benefit from its universities, it is essential that there be sound communications between the universities and the government on the issues of mutual concern which affect the ability of the universities to fully optimize their performance of these three vital goals. This report endorses a suggestion of the universities that a committee of Cabinet Ministers and senior university officials be established to provide a means for regular discussion of the broad common agenda.

Better ongoing dialogue and cooperation between the universities is also important. The proposals of the universities outlined in this report are very constructive. In particular the proposal for a new Inter-University Council and a University Coordinating Committee should provide an ongoing institutional basis for cooperation as well as a framework to provide oversight for the joint university projects which have been specifically identified. The Council and the Committee should be very helpful in permitting the universities, through discussion, to better understand each other and to articulate and pursue distinctive missions that are consistent with the resources available to support them.

These institutional changes should fill communication gaps which presently appear to exist. Until now, those gaps have inhibited effective inter-university cooperation and have stood in the way of the province obtaining the greatest possible benefit from its universities. I view these new structures as offering significant potential.

I have emphasized in this report the importance which I believe university education, and the universities that provide it, have for Saskatchewan in the future. Just as the universities face questions of revitalization, so does the province. Therefore, the province obviously must determine those "building blocks" through which society may achieve the goal of a higher quality of life, both economic and social, in the century ahead.

There are too few such building blocks. This report argues that this is a time for investment in Saskatchewan's young people and that the universities are key to the success of that endeavour. In addition, economic renewal and diversification in the province will require the effective ideas and research infrastructure which the universities can provide. Thus, in this report I urge the prioritization of university education as an identifiable resource upon which to build the province.

Important steps will have to be taken by the universities, including in particular the refurbishment of their human resources, the targeting of their program efforts, and the pragmatic renewal and upgrading of their plant. They will have to let some things go. Where that is done, it is obviously important that they work together and with the public, through the government, to achieve a good overall provincial result.

I also make a special case in the report for the need to ensure that the universities fully perform their role in educating increased numbers of aboriginal youth in the decades to come. These young people, like their non-aboriginal contemporaries, will be Saskatchewan's leaders, entrepreneurs and workers in the future. The quality of our society will depend, in large measure, upon their skills and resourcefulness and those things, in turn, will depend upon their education.

I want to say an additional word about the students. The initiatives proposed in this document have, as their objective, to ensure that a quality university education may be had by as many qualified Saskatchewan people as possible, within the limits of the province's resources. These are difficult days for students. In the last decade, there has been a substantial shift in the financing burden of the universities from the public purse to the students themselves. These changes have many implications for the students, the universities and the broader society. There may also be an impact on the governance of the institutions. There are important societal questions as to whether it is equitable or prudent to impose higher and higher debt burdens on a whole generation of graduates. These are fundamental questions for the universities and for our society as a whole.

Much is made these days of the intergenerational equity issues which are inherent in everything from our public debt to the cost of medical care. One way for society as a whole (and its older generations in particular) to redress that intergenerational balance would be to make the provision of reasonable financial assistance to post-secondary students a key priority. By doing so the goal of accessibility to post-secondary education would itself remain within reach.

As I have noted in this report, these are not all issues which can be addressed only by a single provincial government. They undoubtedly require a collaborative national effort.

The bottom line, however, is that without the students there will be no universities. Without the universities there will be no professionals, scholars and literate critical thinkers. Without the latter, Canada and Saskatchewan can certainly not succeed.

Thus the importance of the university enterprise. This report expresses the hope that Saskatchewan, through its university communities and its government, can play an effective leading role in national university renewal. Because Saskatchewan is a relatively small province, with only two universities, the report argues that Saskatchewan should be in a position, through collaborative action, to succeed more quickly than other larger jurisdictions where more institutional agendas, thicker layers of bureaucracy and more difficult government-university communications prevail.

Having said all of that, the repositioning of Saskatchewan's universities will be no easy task. More importantly, it will not be achieved quickly. It will require persistent effort and much goodwill on the part of all concerned.

Before turning to the proposals of the universities, I propose to review the external environment in which the universities will be operating in the years ahead and, in addition, to provide a perspective of each of the universities as they exist today. It is important that the government and the broader Saskatchewan public should have an accurate impression of these institutions as they assess the manner in which the universities propose to operate in the future.

THE SASKATCHEWAN UNIVERSITIES TODAY

An informed analysis of the future shape of the universities in Saskatchewan must begin with a clear understanding of the institutions as they exist today.

Measured by the traditional university measure of full-time equivalent students the University of Saskatchewan ranks in the top third of Canadian universities and the University of Regina is about medium size. Given Saskatchewan's population, the relatively large size of the two universities, taken together, attests to the success which they have had in meeting the goal of accessibility which has been a hallmark of university public policy in Saskatchewan since the University of Saskatchewan was first established by Act of the Legislative Assembly in 1907.

Much has been written on the question of accessibility. Saskatchewan people and their universities have, through their endorsement of the accessibility objective, endeavoured to ensure that access to university education (including a wide range of programs encompassing both undergraduate and graduate opportunities and the professions) would be available on an affordable basis to all Saskatchewan residents who meet designated standards. It has also been thought appropriate to extend that educational access to as wide an array of high quality programs as could be provided with the available funds. Finally, in more recent years accessibility has

taken on a geographic connotation. Efforts have been made so that, to the extent possible, access to a university education would be available on a basis which would minimize the distance students were required to travel, thereby providing university education opportunities to more people on an equitable basis throughout the province.

There has been a continuing debate in the university community as to how the goal of providing an accessible educational opportunity is to be balanced against the maintenance of high quality institutions. That debate has noted that the commitment of the universities to the societal goal of accessibility and the concurrent goal of high quality education is premised on the assumption that there will be sufficient funds available to achieve these two important (but costly) goals at the same time.

Scarcity of funds in the universities (particularly in the present environment in which there is a significant near-term downward pressure on the amount of money available for the universities' operating budgets) will force the institutions to address anew the manner in which they balance their commitments to accessibility and high quality. The public, through the government and other avenues of expression, will undoubtedly want to participate in that discussion.

To put it another way, if the universities have over a period of time operated within a given fiscal environment and have managed to achieve an appropriate equilibrium between accessibility and quality, it is self-evident that a substantial reduction in funding will require a rebalancing. If accessibility in all of its aspects is to be fully maintained with the more limited resources, it seems to me inevitable that the quality of education will fall, perhaps to unacceptable levels.

This could occur because, for example, (a) the size of classes grows beyond reason, (b) the universities lose the ability to compensate faculty in a competitive manner so as to be able to attract and keep scholars of national and international calibre, or (c) the universities maintain all of their programs but without the economic strength to fund any of them adequately.

Alternatively some way will be found (for example, by restricting the array of programs offered or in some other way shrinking the universities) to permit the continued delivery of high quality programs on a scaled back basis. In this latter alternative the scope of the universities, and their available programs, would be tailored to the more limited resources available.

These are the threshold decisions which must be made at both Saskatchewan universities. They demand hard choices of the universities' Boards of Governors, faculty, administrators, employees and students. If the universities shirk the responsibility they have to reshape themselves, the repositioning of the universities will become the task of the government, acting in the public interest. The thesis of this report, however, is that it would be premature for the government to intervene because there is reason for hope that the universities themselves will have the fibre to squarely address their challenges.

The discussions I have concluded leave me cautiously optimistic that this will be so, although there are important constraints which have to be overcome.

In a relatively short period of dialogue in the process I have facilitated, the two universities have worked together to establish a framework for change, particulars of which are noted below. As you had hoped, the individual universities will now proceed with their individual planning and decision-making against an enhanced backdrop of collaboration in administrative matters. Of even more importance, the universities have proposed a new framework for dialogue with each other and with government when program decisions have interinstitutional, or wider provincial, implications.

Throughout the growth cycles of both the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina, very significant (and generous) expenditures of public funds from the Saskatchewan treasury have been made to ensure that the two goals of accessibility and quality could be met. Where needed, new physical plant was acquired and funded. For example, the universities occupy over 2,200 acres of prime real estate in Saskatoon and Regina and collectively they occupy over 6,000,000 square feet of operating space. The estimated replacement cost of the land and buildings is well in excess of \$1,000,000,000. Facilities were expanded, when required, to meet the changing needs. New faculty were hired and, taken together, the universities today offer an array of programs which permit Saskatchewan students to study almost any discipline at the university level without leaving the province.

With the curtailment of public funding which has become a year-to-year fact of planning life on the campuses during the period of fiscal restraint across Canada during the 1990's, the Saskatchewan universities, like their counterparts elsewhere in the country, face a dramatically different environment. As provincial funding is withdrawn and as the ability of the universities, for reasons of equity and practicality, to replace these funds with other sources of revenue, such as tuition, becomes more restricted or disappears, the universities again face the fundamental question of how to rebalance themselves to achieve now (and put into balance for the future) the goals of accessibility and high quality. The achievement of this balance constitutes the major issue facing the two Saskatchewan universities as they now address their collective futures. The public in the province will have its eye on another important goal—to ensure that, where possible, the universities act in a cooperative and complementary fashion as they conduct their institutional missions, financed as they are primarily by public funds.

I believe that the discussions in which I have participated have made progress to that end. Whether the progress proves to be large or small will depend upon whether the initiatives which are proposed are supported, and implemented, both by the university communities and the government. In addition, key decisions in respect of the reshaping of the two universities, at the program level, must be addressed in the first instance on the two campuses and those discussions are of course critical. At the very least, we have through the process now concluded initiated a very active and open dialogue between the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina at many levels. A continuation and expansion of that dialogue is essential.

Attached as Appendix A is an overview of the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina as they are today. It describes their physical facilities, human resources, students and programs. It outlines their impressive research capacities and their federated and affiliated colleges. It describes their governance structures. Both universities are large institutions which

play an important role in the communities in which they are located and in the province as a whole. It may be useful to first put in perspective some of the important highlights of the universities as they now are.

University of Saskatchewan

The University of Saskatchewan, which was established by Act of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly in 1907, has a long and distinguished tradition of service to the Province of Saskatchewan. To put the University of Saskatchewan today in perspective the following highlights should be noted:

- The university offers an extraordinarily wide array of programs. The Johnson Report concluded in 1993 that the University of Saskatchewan has the greatest range of colleges and programs of any equivalent sized university in Canada.
- In the 1995-96 academic year the university, including St. Thomas More College (a federated college which has been federated with the University of Saskatchewan since 1936), had 14,863 full-time students and 3,933 part-time students. This represents a 51% increase in full-time enrolment since 1972 (when there were 9,848 full-time degree students). At the same time a new university of significant size was established at Regina.
- In the 1994-95 academic year 3,154 full-time employees were supported by the operating funds of the university, including 1,000 members of faculty. In addition there were more than 2,084 part-time employees, including 392 sessional lecturers providing instruction on a course-by-course basis.
- The budgeted expenditures (net of recoveries) of the University of Saskatchewan in the 1995-96 academic year were \$168,714,179. The university is a dominant employer in the City of Saskatoon and a major force in the provincial economy.
- In the 1994-95 academic year the faculty of the University of Saskatchewan received more than \$49 million in research grants from research councils, governments and other sources in a wide range of activities spanning the humanities and the social sciences, agricultural and medical research, and other research in the natural sciences and other fields of university and community endeavour.
- In recent years there has been dramatic evidence of the synergistic applied economic spinoff associated with the research work of the university. Innovation Place, located on university land and administered jointly by the university and the Province of Saskatchewan, is one of Canada's most successful university-based research parks. At present some 95 companies operate at Innovation Place with more than 1,500 employees. Many are entrepreneurial ventures in fields such as biotechnology, information technology and other knowledge-based enterprises, with their roots in discoveries made at the university.
- The university points with justifiable pride to its continuing research efforts, many of which are of international stature. Examples are described in Appendix A at page 25.

- The university has recently been recommended to be the site of Canada's only synchrotron light source research facility. This \$115 million project, which is in the final stages of review, will (if fully funded and built) enhance the university's research capacity and stature in the national and international scientific communities.
- Of the full-time faculty, over 47% are aged 50 or over (30% are 55 or over). The demographic profile of faculty is a reflection of the very substantial growth in faculty in the late 1960's and the early 1970's and the inability of the university since that time (by reason of the cessation of its growth, the flattening of its student enrolment and the rigidity of some of the university's employment structures) to renew the faculty profile.
- The University of Saskatchewan is host to Western Canada's only undergraduate school of veterinary science, a unique cooperative venture of the four western provinces, the continuing success of which establishes it as a model for emulation by governments and the universities in other disciplines as the Canadian university landscape is restructured.
- From its beginnings the University of Saskatchewan has had an overt commitment to providing service relevant to the Province of Saskatchewan. In the early days of the university that commitment was characterized primarily through agricultural extension activities, which continue today. This commitment to service remains an important part of the ethos of the University of Saskatchewan.
- In the 1995-96 academic year tuition and student fees accounted for approximately 25% of the university's operating budget and most of the remainder of the funds were received from the province's block operating grant (\$118,322,600).
- The health sciences colleges at the University of Saskatchewan, particularly the College of Medicine, play a pivotal role in the province's health care system. Approximately 30% of the total expenditures of the College of Medicine (\$15.7 million in 1994-95) is derived from its allocation in the university's operating budget and nearly half of the remainder (\$36,424,112 in 1994-95) is funded either directly or indirectly by the Department of Health.
- The total per student cost of delivering the array of programs offered at the University of Saskatchewan varies widely from an approximate low of \$3,600 (in the College of Commerce) to a high of approximately \$32,500 (in the College of Medicine).
- The University of Saskatchewan has undertaken a rigorous planning process during recent years (see for example studies prepared by the university in its Program Audit Project, the final report of which, entitled The Challenges Ahead: The University of Saskatchewan Looks Towards Its Second Century, was published in December, 1995) which will assist it to analyze the academic program options available to it.

University of Regina

The University of Regina was established in 1974 as a separate institution. Prior to that time it and its predecessors had operated as a separate campus of the University of Saskatchewan (from 1959 to 1974) or, earlier, as a residential Methodist Church School (from 1911 to 1925) and as a junior or affiliated college of the University of Saskatchewan (1925-1959). The decision to establish the University of Regina in 1974 followed several years of controversy as to the wisdom of establishing a separate campus, as compared to other alternatives such as a single university with significant autonomy for each campus.

Since that time the issue of the continuation of a separate university has occasionally been raised. The Johnson Report, in its searching analysis of the Saskatchewan university system and its detailed review of program duplication matters, noted that the University of Regina had become a large and distinctive institution. It concluded that further reconsideration of the separate status of the University of Regina was unproductive. I agree with that conclusion. The discussions which I have facilitated have taken as a premise that Saskatchewan will continue to have two separate universities and that our task is to achieve, where reasonable and practical, complementarity and collaboration.

Highlights in respect of the University of Regina include the following:

- The University of Regina has emphasized the delivery of an array of traditional programs in the arts and sciences and other disciplines, while implementing programs considered by the university to be complementary to those available at the University of Saskatchewan. For example, it established professional degree programs in social work and human justice, journalism and public administration. In more recent years it has fostered the Language Institute.
- In 1976 the University of Regina was a trailblazing sponsor of the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College (“SIFC”) with its much needed emphasis on post-secondary opportunities for aboriginal people. Today SIFC is the leading example of Indian-administered post-secondary education in Canada. From its creation in 1976 with a student enrolment of 9 it has grown in size (in 1995-96 over 890 students, most of them aboriginal, were enrolled in university through SIFC) and the scope of its program offerings continues to expand. Since 1976 more than 1388 degrees have been awarded by the University of Regina to SIFC students many of whom now play leadership roles in their communities.
- The university has actively promoted its University Entrance Program, through which students without formal credentials sufficient for university admission qualify themselves for full participation in the university. The program, which was begun in 1977-78, is considered by the university to be an important vehicle to expand access to a university education to many, particularly aboriginal people and older students, who would otherwise be disenfranchised.

- The University of Regina is characterized by the importance of its federated colleges (SIFC, Luther College and Campion College) with their emphasis upon providing student services to their particular clientele.
- The University of Regina has, since 1969, been a vigorous proponent of cooperative study programs. Students in its education, administration and engineering faculties alternate periods of their academic education with periods of on-the-job experience.
- Full-time student enrolment in the 1995-1996 academic year, including all of the federated colleges, was 8,151 (together with 866 full-time students enrolled in the University Entrance Program) compared to 3,599 in 1974, an increase of 126%. In addition 3,576 part-time students were enrolled in the University of Regina in 1995-1996.
- Partly as a result of the many mature students who enter university through the University of Regina University Entrance Program, the average age of University of Regina full-time undergraduate students is 23.6 compared to 22.6 in Saskatoon. The University Entrance Program also explains in part the greater number of part-time students at the University of Regina since many who pursue the program continue with their university education while, at the same time, maintaining their employment status.
- In the 1995-96 year the University of Regina had 820 full-time employees, including 305 faculty members. In addition, there were 906 part-time employees, including 258 sessional lecturers.
- The age profile of the faculty at the University of Regina shows similar characteristics to that at the University of Saskatchewan. 53% of the faculty are 50 or more years of age (34% are 55 years or more). As at the University of Saskatchewan, the faculty demography is characterized by an older faculty and by a disproportionately large number of male members.
- The University of Regina is a significant force in the Regina and Southern Saskatchewan economy. During the 1995-96 academic year its operating budget was \$65,711,500 (net of recoveries). \$44,340,400 was funded by the province's block operating grant and \$18,676,751 was provided by student fees and tuition.
- During 1995-96, University of Regina faculty were awarded \$6.2 million in research grants.
- The university is in the course of implementing, in partnership with the Government of Saskatchewan, a research park located on the university campus at Regina which will provide a base for software development and applied research in telecommunication technology, including companies started by university faculty members or using university discoveries.

- Of the first-time, first-year undergraduate students attending the University of Regina, 70% come from Regina and its surrounding area and 87% from come from southern regions of the province. Of the same group at the University of Saskatchewan, 54% come from Saskatoon and its surrounding area and an additional 21% come from other northern regions of the province.
- The University of Regina conducted a careful review of its mission and direction in the late 1980's (reported under the title From Reflection to Renewal: Report of the Academic Review Task Force). In the spring of 1996, the university initiated a strategic planning process, which is to be implemented in the fall of 1996, to help it to respond to its present fiscal dilemma.
- The University of Regina has accumulated an operating deficit which, according to the university's financial statements, was \$7,883,000 at the conclusion of the 1994-95 fiscal year. Although the deficit at the end of 1995-96 is expected by the university to be significantly reduced, its financing and elimination add to the planning difficulties facing this university.

In my assessment the University of Saskatchewan appears to be somewhat better positioned to address the difficult problems and the opportunities which face it than does the University of Regina. This is so in part because, over its much longer life as an autonomous institution, it has developed a determined institutional sense of confidence and a cadre of supportive alumni, whose interest in the university is reflected in the university's substantial success in quickly exceeding its \$30,000,000 fund-raising goal in its recent capital campaign. The University of Saskatchewan has no accumulated deficit and it has undertaken a searching self-analysis, through its recent program audit process and the work of its University Studies Group. That having been said, there are also many challenges for the University of Saskatchewan if it is to maintain the role of a respected research university in the Canadian university world, a role which it has enjoyed throughout most of this century.

For example, it was reported to me that 10 large Canadian universities have in recent years structured an informal alliance through which to lobby governments (particularly the federal government) and their granting agencies to focus more of their research grants on the 10 participants. The underlying thesis of those universities is that the federal government would get better value if it concentrated its funding within the Group of 10 rather than spreading it thinly over the more than 60 Canadian universities. A number of major Canadian universities, including the University of Saskatchewan with its substantial scientific and medical research capacity, were excluded without consultation.

Thus, the University of Saskatchewan too faces real questions as to how it should deploy its resources in the future to ensure that it remains a vibrant, creative institution, capable of fulfilling its stated mission of service to the province while maintaining accessibility and quality.

At the University of Regina different factors are at work. The university was conceived as an institution which would provide effective education in the arts and sciences, education and other

disciplines for residents of Regina and Southern Saskatchewan and which would also meet emerging post-secondary opportunities (such as those in the education of aboriginal people and in public administration). However, over time, some of its niche program initiatives have lost their original special focus and instead have taken on a more general character. In addition, in an era of fiscal restraint, it may also be necessary for the university to revisit whether all the program niches and areas of specialization continue to have sufficient provincial merit to justify funding at the expense of core programs. Given its more recent creation as a autonomous institution, the University of Regina also does not have as many alumni in senior positions to whom it can turn for support. As it builds its own traditions, the University of Regina has yet to fully establish its institutional esprit. It has a not-insignificant deficit. It will be important for it to carve out a clear and distinctive sense of mission and purpose in the time ahead to build upon its considerable accomplishments over the last 22 years.

The Maclean's Magazine Assessment of the Universities

It is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain an objective assessment of the quality and stature of each of the two universities as a whole. This is so in part because most of the things which the universities do (their teaching, research and community service, for example) are in whole or in part intangible; their worth is only subjectively assessable and may well differ, as seen through the eyes of different beholders.

Several years ago Maclean's Magazine embarked upon an annual review process in which Canadian universities were described and evaluated. The Maclean's system first divides Canadian universities into three categories—Medical/Doctoral (the University of Saskatchewan falls within this category), “Comprehensive” (the University of Regina falls within this category), and “Primarily Undergraduate”. These categories are determined through an arbitrary classification in which Medical/Doctoral universities are those which have a broad range of PhD programs and research, as well as medical schools; Comprehensive Universities are those with a significant amount of research activity and a wide range of programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels; and Primarily Undergraduate universities are those which focus almost entirely on undergraduate education.

Having divided the universities into these three categories Maclean's then assesses each in a number of categories relating to the composition of the student body, university class size and related issues, faculty education and grant success, university finances and library priorities (all of which are input factors), and reputation as measured both by alumni support and a “reputational survey”. These rankings are controversial in Canadian universities. Many on the university campuses consider the input factors and other measures to be inadequate assessment tools. Others suggest that only by a careful analysis of the outcomes of university education (ranging all the way from success of graduates in entering the job market to broad scale contributions to community and long time life success) or, alternatively, by some assessment of the “value” added during the course of a university education, could universities be fairly assessed, the one against the other.

Thus, many universities are very critical of the Maclean's methodology and feel that it leads to inappropriate assessment or, at the most, to statistically-derived conclusions in an area where statistics prove little. Thus, many universities have opted out of the Maclean's survey. According to the 1995 survey, some 15 Canadian universities had declined to participate, apparently because they considered the assessment methodology to be flawed. Among them was the University of Regina. The University of Saskatchewan, although a continuing survey participant, is also critical of the Maclean's approach.

For the record I have examined the Maclean's rankings and the individual evaluation component assessments of the two Saskatchewan universities. According to Maclean's the University of Saskatchewan ranked in the bottom quartile during each of the 1993, 1994 and 1995 years in the Medical/Doctoral class (in which Canada's largest universities are congregated). The University of Regina, before it opted out of the survey, ranked near the middle of the 13 smaller Comprehensive class universities.

I am not persuaded that these Maclean's rankings, or any other like assessment, assist materially in resolving any of the issues presently facing Saskatchewan's universities.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITIES IN SASKATCHEWAN

A word should be said about the roles which these two universities play in our province. The universities have a concern that, too often, they are understood to be only teaching institutions, with an undergraduate teaching function, whereas the role of the universities, as they see it, extends well beyond that important responsibility.

I believe that this is an important point. For government from time to time to assess how it will participate in the funding of the universities, and for the public to hold the universities accountable for the funds which are entrusted to their stewardship, there must be a clear and shared understanding of the proper role of these institutions in our province. Absent that, there will inevitably be periodic discomfort as to the legitimacy of the universities' activities and as to the manner in which public funds are expended.

Thus, I believe that it is valuable to put in clear focus what it is that universities have traditionally done in Western liberal democratic society because it is that multi-faceted role to which both the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina strive on a daily basis. It is a role which is not properly understood, and certainly not fairly valued, by the public.

At their best, universities are places in which knowledge is conveyed (from scholar to scholar and from teacher to student) and in which knowledge is also critically assessed and, at times, created. This latter function, the research function, entails the review, analysis, synthesis and challenging of existing knowledge. The teaching and research roles provide the base for the universities' community service.

Teaching

As teaching institutions, it is the responsibility of the universities to encourage students to become critical thinkers so as to be full participants in our society. In some disciplines, of course, the task goes well beyond the equipping of students for critical thought and for full participation as citizens in a society beset by near constant change, with its resulting anxieties and opportunities. In these other respects the universities educate their students to perform roles in society which are essential to its smooth functioning, maintenance, preservation and progress. Thus the universities educate doctors, educators, lawyers, nurses, engineers, journalists and others whose practical skills, applied creatively, are essential to our country and our province. Both universities in Saskatchewan acknowledge this teaching mission. Through its performance, they not only equip Saskatchewan young people and others to enter Canadian society but they also provide most of those who staff the essential professions in Saskatchewan.

Thus, the teaching mission is one essential component of the universities' historic task. It should be noted that this includes teaching at the undergraduate level and also, where the capability of the scholars of the faculty or college permits, graduate education which, at root, helps the universities to fulfil both their knowledge conveyance and their knowledge synthesis and creation mandates.

Public emphasis in respect of university education is primarily, sometimes exclusively, focused upon this teaching component. Thus, individual members of the public are inclined to judge the success, the responsiveness and the accountability of the universities in their public mission by anecdotal experiences in respect of teaching. Has a student been able to enter a particular program or enrol in a particular class? Was an instructor an effective teacher, as perceived by a student, or did the professor appear to be so caught up with research work that the teaching appeared to be a burden and not a mission? Why should the universities restrict teaching loads to provide significant opportunity for other hard-to-comprehend professorial activity, including research? How can professors without much training in teaching skills expect to be good teachers? How can teaching be assessed and properly rewarded in a university environment? Why can't bad university teachers be weeded out? In short, is the public getting a bang for its buck on the educational front?

These are matters of concern, not only to the public but also to those on campus who are genuinely interested in the long term well-being of universities. The value of the teaching function *is* sometimes obscured in the university environment. Where this occurs, teaching *does* suffer and, with it, the quality of education. Thus the universities must always recognize the importance which those who provide the funds—the public and, more and more, the students— ascribe to teaching and they will have to work to ensure its prioritization and value within the institutions.

However, those who ask such questions must also put in perspective the other important responsibilities which universities have in Western liberal democracies—roles in respect of research and service to the community. Each of these other roles deserves comment and public explanation, as Saskatchewan's universities are assessed by the government and by the public.

Research

In respect of research, I have noted above the need for universities, if they are to remain stimulating centres of knowledge conveyance and creation, to retain a climate of intellectual ferment. Traditionally this has been achieved by nurturing and valuing what is described, for want of a better term, as “research”. In its broadest perspective, this research function operates at two levels:

- (a) There is, in the first place, the traditional scholarly research role of the universities—i.e. the reflective review and critical analysis of knowledge in a particular area. Thus, the university environment at its best is one in which dogmas are put to the test, in which accepted truths are questioned and in which new perspectives and, indeed, new knowledge are sought and valued. Faculty are encouraged to push out the horizons of knowledge in their respective fields as an activity, consuming in time and energy, substantially valued for its own sake. They are encouraged to share the results of their work through publication. This research function is equally applicable across the disciplines and program areas of the modern university.
- (b) In the second place the university is, in many of its disciplines (particularly the medical and natural sciences), a place of sponsored or contract research in which research councils, governments or other institutions (whether companies or others) fund specific research projects. Some of such research is sponsored by government funding agencies in response to research project applications of faculty members. Research funding of this sort is the subject of active competition among universities and faculty. In addition other third parties may commission specific research activities tailored to the needs of the funder.

Both sponsored and contract research raise issues, some financial and some of a moral and governance nature, for the university community. In respect of sponsored research, it is a concern of the universities that the cost of the universities' infrastructure is not taken into account appropriately in the grants, thereby placing a support burden on the universities through their operating budgets. Many in the university community question whether contract research does not compromise the unbridled pursuit of knowledge which is thought to be inherent to academic freedom? At what point, it is asked, would contract research grow so pervasive that it would oust control of a university's agenda from the university to the third party sponsors? These and other questions are beyond the reach of the discussions in which I have been engaged and I note them merely to illustrate some of the issues which the universities face in respect of sponsored and contract research.

Thus, it is important to note that Saskatchewan's universities, like their counterparts elsewhere, are engaged in the active pursuit of research activities. There are those, both within and outside the universities, who contend that one result of the universities' research focus and the peer-review process of the faculty (with its major focus on research productivity, which are in many respects more measurable than teaching outcomes) has been to unduly orient the university to the research function. Critics suggest that the “publish or perish” mentality, sometimes claimed to be

associated with the universities' research activity, has obliged faculty who seek to progress in their academic careers to over-emphasize the research function, at the expense of their teaching.

It is obvious that it will never be easy to strike an appropriate balance between these two activities. In my opinion, the universities will have to work very hard, not only to persuade the public of the legitimacy of their research function (a function which I believe to be essential if the two universities are in fact to remain vibrant quality institutions and make their full contribution to the province), but also to demonstrate their real commitment to teaching. It is probably inevitable that the ordinary citizen, the taxpayer whose dollars fund the institutions, will continue to look to the indicia of good teaching, however difficult to evaluate, as the true measure of university quality rather than the success of the research function.

In order to maintain the confidence of the Saskatchewan public I believe that intensified work will have to be done by the two universities to ensure the proper training, retraining and review of the instructional skills of faculty members. It may very well be necessary to establish optional career paths for faculty which will permit a separate track of career advancement for those who concentrate on achieving excellence in their teaching commitments with a lesser research focus and to permit them to advance through the system, to preagreed levels, with the same assurance as their more research-oriented colleagues. In addition, these efforts will have to be explained to the Saskatchewan public.

In respect of the research function of the university, the universities will also have to communicate more effectively what they do and why that activity has public worth. For the reasons mentioned above, I am persuaded that the universities' scholarly research activity is absolutely essential as an end in itself (given the intellectual vibrancy associated with scholarly research and the resulting benefit to the campus climate) and also that the formidable intellectual talent of the faculty, harnessed in sponsored and contract research, can be of inestimable value in solving society's problems. Perhaps if the government and the public better understood the universities' research capacity and commitment, they would be better able to articulate problems and goals to which that capacity could be applied.

Community Service

University faculty members are also expected to spend a significant amount of their time on administrative matters and in community service.

Dealing first with the administrative function, the traditions of the university, which include the practice of decision-making on a "bottom-up" basis, require faculty members to devote large amounts of time (some have argued too much time) to the administration of their departments, colleges or faculties. Vital program review and development and curriculum decisions are shaped in those discussions. As long as the universities remain self-governing autonomous institutions, such work is obviously important to their success. Notwithstanding that, pressures continue in some quarters to revamp the universities' management systems to streamline these procedures so as to abridge the time which faculty devote to these activities.

Finally, universities throughout the world (and in particular the universities in Saskatchewan by way of their stated missions) have a commitment and tradition of service to the community. The first President of the University of Saskatchewan, Walter Murray, took as the model for the new institution in 1907 the example of the University of Wisconsin, a state university with “the conception of it as the scientific arm of the state for research, for carrying the benefits of science to all and sundry in the state and for the supply of information to legislative assemblies and their executives”. President Murray compared his vision of the state university, caught up with the notion of service to the broader society around it, with the more reflective, inward looking traditions of the “Oxford type” of university.

Today, the missions of the two universities continue in the Murray tradition. They emphasize the commitment which each university has to reach outside its campus and to provide service of practical worth to the Province of Saskatchewan. The universities in Saskatchewan have not merely paid lip service to these ideals—their presence in the Saskatchewan community is large and their contributions are well-known. Notwithstanding this, it will remain a day-to-day challenge to university faculty to be even more actively involved in the years ahead so that they play their full roles in Saskatchewan in the Murray tradition. Community service is a stated goal of the universities and it is an expectation of their funding publics.

In my view it remains the combination of these activities—teaching, research and community service—which, when applied in a dynamic institution, can ensure continued relevance for the universities. There are fast-changing, and in some ways, disturbing factors either now present or looming on the horizon which concern the academic community. Universities everywhere are reshaping themselves, in either large or small measure to prepare for the new millennium. The traditional university activities (teaching, research and service) certainly continue to be the building blocks of the universities but they will have to be applied in new and creative ways.

It is clear from a review of much that is being written on these topics, and from my discussions, that there are no absolute truths capable of universal and immediate application to the Saskatchewan context. It is equally clear that the governing bodies and the academic communities of both the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina will, in the next several months, be called upon to evaluate how they should position their institutions for the decades ahead. To do that they will be examining the general forces which are operating upon the university community at large. In addition, they will be looking more particularly at the Saskatchewan environment. Before turning to the specific proposals which have been advanced by the universities, it is useful to touch briefly upon those external and domestic factors.

EXTERNAL FACTORS

As universities everywhere look ahead, a number of major factors are in play which, some argue, could fundamentally alter the shape of university education in the decades ahead. Briefly summarized, prominent among those factors are the following:

1. *New Learner Needs*

In the post-war period, the teaching responsibilities of many universities, including those in Saskatchewan, were directed primarily to the education of high school graduates. In recent times, the university campuses have seen a significant change in the age composition and backgrounds of much of their student populations. Increasingly older students, some returning for further qualifications or retraining (or upgrading), make up a significant part of the student population mix. Many argue that in the rapidly changing job marketplace of the future the phenomenon of a shift in the university population from recent high school graduate to lifetime learner will continue. If so, one result is likely to be the unpredictability of demand for the universities' services. No longer will institutions be able to safely predict future enrolments by simple reference to the cohort of graduates expected from feeder secondary school institutions.

Another dimension of these changing demands may be the request, from individuals and businesses, that universities make programs available on a non-traditional modular basis tailored to meet their specific learning needs, rather than merely providing the traditional packaging of programs in the undergraduate or postgraduate degree models, presented on the annual or semester basis, of the past. Campuses may well see ever-increasing numbers of part-time students.

2. *New Competitive Forces: Traditional On-Campus Model*

As learner needs change and as the fiscal pressures on all universities increase, many institutions will attempt to ensure a continuing strong demand in their student enrolment by actively recruiting students from other jurisdictions. Thus, universities from outside Saskatchewan have begun to actively recruit in Saskatchewan high schools. In addition, Saskatchewan undergraduate university students have an increasingly wide array of options as they consider whether to pursue their professional and postgraduate training in Saskatchewan or elsewhere.

3. *New Competitive Forces: Technology and Distance Education Model*

Some universities and other post-secondary institutions, both public and private, are implementing, on a concerted basis, sophisticated technology-driven distance education programs to supplement their traditional on-campus activities. Although now costly, such initiatives enable the universities who sponsor them to offer their programs in a far flung manner, well beyond the boundaries of the state or province in which they have their campuses.

A well-known example is the executive MBA program which Queen's University offers through multi-point video conferencing in 22 Canadian cities and in Bermuda. According to news reports, Queen's is currently negotiating to extend the program to Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and other Asian countries. Accordingly, in the 1996-1997 academic year a Saskatchewan student resident in Regina or Saskatoon will be able to attend

Queen's University without leaving the student's Saskatchewan home. Institutions offering such programs will be able to recruit on a scale (without traditional classroom size worries) and in geographic territories not imaginable a few years ago, while at the same time enhancing or replacing traditional public sector revenues. It is reported that the tuition for the Queen's program will be \$47,000 for the two year program although there are apparently hopes that the prices will decline as technology usage increases and its cost declines.

4. *Changing Roles and Expectations*

In many jurisdictions there is pressure for a considerable rethinking of the traditional roles of the university. There are competing demands, on the one hand, for universities to be more quickly attuned and responsive to research opportunities directed to achieving economic growth (sometimes of the “quick-fix” variety). On the other hand, as noted above there is pressure in some quarters for the universities to retreat from their research mission in favour of an increased emphasis on teaching and basic liberal education, particularly at the undergraduate level.

In a society of rapid institutional change, publics also grow concerned that universities (whose culture, tradition and governance structures have historically permitted change only incrementally and slowly) may not be adapting fast enough in a world in which radical and immediate change, political, economic and social, is evident at every hand. In the result there are demands for greater university accountability in the spending of public monies and, in direct response, university communities are quick to defend traditional values of university autonomy and academic freedom. The critics, in turn, argue that those latter defences are sometimes thinly veiled disguises to protect the status quo ante, to deny necessary change, and to serve personal goals of university faculty and administrators.

The public debate on many of these broad issues is at an early stage. There is little consensus as to the impact and significance of each of these factors and there is certainly no consensus as to the specific responses which universities should make in such an environment. Thus, as far as I can see there are no obvious lessons which Saskatchewan should derive from other jurisdictions for application in this province.

Instead, for the reasons mentioned below, in my opinion Saskatchewan will be best served by a made-in-Saskatchewan solution that recognizes and, where possible, builds upon some of the advantages and traditions which we, as a jurisdiction enjoy.

SASKATCHEWAN FACTORS

All of the broad issues facing universities elsewhere are applicable in Saskatchewan. In addition, there are factors specific to the province which are realities to be borne carefully in mind as the Saskatchewan solutions are found.

1. *Enrolment Projections*

It is obvious that the ability of a university to successfully present its programs at any given level depends upon a steady (or growing) enrolment of students. Forecasting enrolments is notoriously difficult and my attention was drawn to many forecasting errors that have been made in the past. Having said that, I believe that more attention should be paid to the underlying factors which may affect future enrolment in Saskatchewan in order to more properly “size” the universities in the upcoming round of planning and decisions.

Consider the following factors, all of which may impact upon future enrolment at both universities:

- A basic factor is the size, and growth profile, of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan's population is rising, but slowly. For example, from 1980 to 1996, Saskatchewan's population increased from 967,100 to 1,020,138. In the most recent years there has been moderate population growth. In light of the present underlying changes to the Saskatchewan economy (including the adjustment to the agricultural sector) it seems unlikely to me that there will be a period of rapid population growth in the province. For planning purposes, therefore, the universities in Saskatchewan cannot depend upon an increasing population within their natural market area to provide significant additional student demand.
- The participation rate of Saskatchewan residents in university education is already high; according to some estimates it is second only to Nova Scotia for 18 to 24 year olds. That being so, there appears to be little opportunity for significant increased demand through an increased participation rate. Indeed, as the mix of aboriginal and non-aboriginal students changes in the years to come, there may be a temporary decline in Saskatchewan's relative participation rate until the present divergence in education participation between those two groups is rectified.
- There are, increasingly, strong external competitive forces, as noted under the heading “External Factors” above.
- Most university educators and informed commentators believe that the high demand for university education in Canada in the last decade has been caused in part by the poor job market for young people. A better national economy would, therefore, likely lead to a decrease in enrolment.
- In recent years actual enrolment figures have been relatively flat, with some downward trends now evident. For example the head count enrolment at the University of Saskatchewan dropped from 1992-93 to 1995-96 by approximately 1,000 students.

- The student population from kindergarten to grade 12 has fallen from a high of 201,143 in 1987-88 to a 10 year low of 194,562 in 1995-96.
- The trend to more lifetime learning will probably continue. This will have the probable effect of increasing demand for part-time university participation and more modular courses. Full-time enrolment at the university may continue to give way to part-time participation.

When all of these factors are put in the mix it is my opinion that student demand on Saskatchewan's universities is likely, at best, to remain constant and, more likely, may decline somewhat in the decade ahead.

I should note, parenthetically, that I was not provided with any detailed post-secondary enrolment forecasts by either of the universities or your department and, as far as I know, there is no Saskatchewan-wide study on this topic. Recognizing that projections are only that, I believe that it would be prudent for your department to initiate a careful study on this subject. Balancing the budget at each university depends in critical measure upon continued strong enrolments and unexpected enrolment declines could lead to unplanned university deficits and the need for further, even more difficult corrective action.

2. *Student Demographic Mix*

Hidden within the population statistics described above are important major shifts in the demographic mix of the Saskatchewan population.

There is a continuing movement of population from small rural communities and farms to larger urban communities. Over time, a higher percentage of students will therefore be residents in urban Saskatchewan, particularly in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon.

The non-aboriginal population of Saskatchewan is rapidly aging and its youth cohort will, according to informed projections, remain constant or decline in the years ahead. In contrast, the aboriginal share of the population will rise and, in particular, an increasingly large percentage of those attending primary and secondary schools will be of aboriginal ancestry. Today the participation rate of aboriginal youth in both secondary and post-secondary education is distressingly small, particularly in engineering, commerce, the sciences and medicine. Strong efforts are being made by the aboriginal community to emphasize education and, in that way, to increase the participation rate. However, there is not yet sufficient experience to assess accurately the manner in which these efforts and the expected change in the demographics of Saskatchewan's youth population will alter the number of those who enrol in university and other post-secondary institutions and the types of programs which they will require.

The universities will have to make reasoned and informed judgments and responses in respect of these issues as time goes on.

3. *The Fiscal Reality*

Saskatchewan, as a province, continues in a period of fiscal restraint. Notwithstanding the success achieved in balancing of the provincial budget on an annual basis, Saskatchewan remains heavily indebted. Saskatchewan government revenues are likely to remain volatile, given the continuing resource based nature of our economy.

Some in the university community to whom I spoke expressed the view that the present financial crisis on the two campuses could be resolved if the Province simply provided more funds to the universities instead of continuing to pursue fiscal restraint. Those concerns were sometimes accompanied by complaints that Saskatchewan's funding of the universities is low given the Province's ability to pay and that provincial priorities have in some way shortchanged universities at the expense of other social programs. We held a number of discussions and analyzed available data to examine those points of view (the results are noted below under the heading "Provincial Support for University Education").

Although I too am an advocate of placing a high priority upon our education system, and upon the universities in particular, the reality in Saskatchewan is that, barring some entirely unpredictable positive change in economic circumstances, the universities cannot expect the Government of Saskatchewan to provide operating funds for general purposes which, on a constant dollar basis, will significantly exceed those which they will receive after giving effect to the measures announced in the 1996 provincial budget. The province's economic recovery continues to depend, first and foremost, in keeping to its financial plan and continuing to get its finances in order.

To put it another way, the only reasonable assumption for the universities and their Boards of Governors is that fiscal restraint in the province will continue to be the order of the day through the planning horizon and that, as a result, the university sector will not obtain any material improvement in its annual share of government's operating funds. The projected new level of the base operating grant in 1998-99 should be considered, for planning purposes, the new base expenditure level.

4. *Faculty Demographics*

The very strong growth of both the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina in the late 1960's and the 1970's led to the recruitment of many new faculty members in those years. Many of those faculty members remain with the two universities and many have become valued senior professors as their experience and stature in their respective disciplines have grown. However, for several years flat enrolments and constrained university budgets have not permitted the addition of many new full-time members to faculty (indeed a number of vacant full-time faculty positions have been eliminated during this period of time). Instead, teaching needs have been increasingly met through the engagement of less costly sessional lecturers employed on a contracted course-by-course program basis.

Thus, instead of having a “normal” age distribution of full-time faculty, which would have been the case had there not been this pattern of large scale recruitment during the period of high growth followed by subsequent and sustained curtailment, the faculty cohorts at both universities are now characterized by a relatively old group of full-time faculty members, nearing but not yet at normal retirement age, and by a small number, in relative terms, of younger faculty members. Attached for reference purposes as Appendix K are data relating to the faculty profile at each of the two institutions and related costs.

There are a number of important implications arising out of this faculty age profile. In the first place the universities are bearing a substantially higher cost of full-time faculty, by reason of the greater than normal seniority, than would be the case if a more even age distribution was in place. Secondly, it is probable that some in this large aging faculty cohort will, in the years ahead, become less productive as they approach retirement, thereby potentially diminishing the vitality of the institutions. Thirdly, the inability of the institutions to hire and integrate new full-time faculty members (because of continuing restraint and the absence of many normal retirements which will open new spaces) has meant that the universities have foregone recruitment at a time when, in many disciplines, there has been a large pool of available talent in Canada.

The issues which arise from these faculty demographics are not unique to the two Saskatchewan universities but, instead, exist in all Canadian universities whose growth patterns are similar to those at the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina. Thus, many institutions face the financial and other issues noted above. Normal retirements will significantly help to resolve these issues but, unless proactive steps are taken, this will occur only after the year 2000.

THE BASIC QUESTIONS

Against this backdrop the universities must address the following questions:

1. What administrative or program adjustments must they make so as to maintain the quality of the institutions? What steps must be taken to rebalance the goals of accessibility and quality in light of the fiscal realities?
2. How can the adjustments be made in a way which will best position the institutions to participate effectively in the competitive national and international university marketplace noted above? How can they hold their market share in servicing Saskatchewan students and reach out with competitive offerings beyond Saskatchewan's borders?
3. How can they achieve these goals on a sustainable basis, i.e. in a way in which the steps taken now do not merely provide an answer to a three year problem, leaving even more difficulties and institutional stress in the time beyond?

4. What are the long term strengths of each of the institutions on which they can build? What will have to be eliminated?
5. How can more collaboration between the two universities be achieved, while preserving the program autonomy of each institution? In aid of the efficient use of resources, how can their missions be further defined and made more distinct?

As the universities address this agenda the challenge for the Boards of Governors and the university academies will be to courageously reposition their respective institutions. That repositioning will have to ensure that each of the universities will be able (a) to attract and maintain capable faculty, (b) to serve large numbers of motivated learners of all ages, and (c) to ensure that modern physical plant and equipment are available to meet the needs of the future.

Those are the three key goals—to maintain an excellent faculty, to attract high quality students and to maintain first class facilities. Given those three continuing ingredients the universities may be expected to continue to contribute meaningfully to Saskatchewan's welfare in the future as they have in the past.

The discussions I have facilitated suggest that to achieve those three goals:

1. At each of the two universities there will have to be a careful re-evaluation of the extent of the program offerings and the manner of the program delivery.
2. The faculty age profile will have to be redefined to address the problem described earlier.
3. The infrastructure and administrative processes of the universities will have to be critically examined to ensure that they have continuing relevance in a technology information age of learning.
4. Within a reasonable time the missions of the two universities will have to be more sharply articulated, recognizing historical traditions, present capabilities and potential, all so as to better assure prudent use of scarce provincial resources.
5. Administrative efficiencies, including collaborative approaches where possible between the two universities, will have to be aggressively pursued and implemented.

My discussions have addressed a number of these issues.

THE NEAR TERM FINANCIAL CHALLENGE

In the budget of the Saskatchewan Government delivered on March 28, 1996 the Minister of Finance announced that there would be no change to the operating funds provided by the province to the universities during the present year and that, in each of the two following years, there would be a \$5,000,000 reduction in the operating grants. Expressed in dollar terms this will

mean an operating grant for the universities of \$162,991,000 in 1996-97, \$157,991,000 in 1997-98 and \$152,991,000 in 1998-99.

Thus, university funding from the provincial government will decline by over 6% over the next 3 years. During that same time period the universities will face possible expenditure increases which will include, at a minimum, the annual career growth increments for faculty contained in the present collective bargaining agreements (estimated to be approximately 2% per annum) and inflationary increases in respect of other services and materials (typically, the inflation rate attached to many goods and services purchased by the universities exceeds the inflation rate measured by the CPI).

The University of Saskatchewan has estimated that the convergence of these factors, assuming no pressure on enrolments, could create a \$19,000,000 cumulative deficit by the end of the third year unless decisive steps are taken. A problem of relative proportion will occur at Regina which will be exacerbated by the University of Regina's continuing deficit. In the years beyond, even greater problems for university sustainability would be likely if hard choices are not made now.

In response, the universities will, in the months that follow, be considering and pursuing a number of options. Those will include discussions with faculty and other employees in respect of their terms of employment (particularly in respect of compensation and benefits), a review of tuition and other revenue sources not dependent on provincial funding, an analysis and implementation of administrative efficiencies (both by independent action and through collaboration between the two universities), and a review of the program offerings of the universities to determine whether changes should be made in the interest of maintaining areas of strength elsewhere in the institutions.

As I see it, the objective for the universities should be to reposition themselves to a new base array of programs, faculty and facilities by 1998-99 so that the long-term core strengths of the university are preserved and may be built upon from that time forward.

PROVINCIAL SUPPORT FOR UNIVERSITY EDUCATION: PICKING PRIORITIES

As noted above, some of those to whom I spoke on the university campuses expressed the opinion that the Saskatchewan public, through decisions of its governments over the last 15 years, had downgraded the priority of university education. One thesis of this argument was that the public did not fully understand and value the contributions which the universities make to Saskatchewan. An alternative thesis was that, in some fashion, the province, through its allocation of funds, had evidenced a greater commitment to primary and secondary education and to social programs and health care than it did to the university sector.

The Johnson Report noted that in constant 1981 dollars, operating grants declined from \$5,300 per student in 1981 to \$4,800 in 1990. Looked at in another way, by the 1998-1999 year provincial operating funding of the universities will have fallen by \$25 million from a high of approximately \$178 million in 1991-1992 to approximately \$153 million in 1998-1999, a reduction in current dollar terms of 14%. The real worth of these grants is further reduced due to inflation over that time period. On conservative future inflation assumptions, the reduction in provincial operating grants in constant dollar terms from 1991-1992 to 1998-1999 will be well in excess of 20%.

The remaining grants are still very large transfers of public funds. However, there can be no gainsaying the material reduction of public funding support for university education which has occurred in Saskatchewan throughout the last two decades and particularly in recent years.

In and of itself, that does not establish inappropriate treatment. As everyone knows, the 1990's have been an unwelcome period of fiscal restraint across Canada, and particularly in Saskatchewan. In addition, complaints about funding reductions bring into focus the question of whether the earlier higher levels of funding were really appropriate or whether they were excessive or, in any event, unsustainable. There is, of course, the additional question of whether, as fiscal restraint has been imposed across public policy areas, decisions have been made fairly for the post-secondary education sector, when put in the mix against other demands on public monies.

It is certainly not within my mandate to sit in judgment on the wisdom of the relative reductions in expenditures which have been made in Saskatchewan in respect of various provincial expenditure categories. However, in order to respond to those who suggest that more money (and only more money) is the solution to the present problem at the universities, I have reviewed data which look at Saskatchewan's support for its universities in two ways: (a) by reviewing expenditure trendlines in a number of provincial public policy areas, and (b) by examining some statistical measures of Saskatchewan's funding of university education compared to the province's ability to pay. These data are certainly not determinative of the questions which have been raised but they do provide a more informed backdrop to any future discussion on these issues.

Attached as Appendix B is some of the data I have reviewed, including in particular (a) as Group I, a 13 year history of the grants (both operating and capital) and a comparison over that time between the universities' grants and the Saskatchewan Government's total operating expenses (excluding debt service), (b) as Group II, relative expenditure changes over the review period in a number of government program areas, and (c) as Group III, interprovincial comparisons to 1993-1994, the latest year for which relevant data are available, showing university operating grants as a percentage of personal income in each province of Canada.

While it is possible to make a number of arguments based upon these data, they do appear to demonstrate a modest downgrading of the priority afforded to university education, compared to other major provincial programs, during this period of time. This trend will be accentuated by the end of the three year budget planning forecast set out in the most recent provincial budget if the allocations stated there remain in place. The data also suggest that Saskatchewan ranks in the middle of Canadian provinces in its commitment to the university sector, when assessed by comparing the operating grants to personal income. Finally, the data show the relatively heavier burden borne by the less wealthy Canadian provinces in order to maintain their university systems.

In short, my conclusion is that, as measured by grants of provincial dollars, there has been a substantial commitment to university education in the province. Annual funding of more than \$150 million speaks for itself. However, looking at the statistics, it is also my assessment that Saskatchewan has not demonstrated any specially high priority to the university sector compared to its other programs and compared to other Canadian jurisdictions.

I have reached a further and, for me, important conclusion after many days of discussions with those concerned with the future of the universities.

Saskatchewan is in a period of fundamental economic and social change. The economic underpinnings, the infrastructure and the rural-urban population mix of Saskatchewan are changing rapidly. At the same time, a new force is emerging in the province as aboriginal communities increasingly take charge of their own affairs through self-government and economic development initiatives, and as aboriginal people become more substantial participants in every facet of the province's life.

In such a period of transformation, the province will have to identify those critical investments which it can make to accommodate these changes and to build for the future. The graduates of the two universities in the next two decades will be expected to provide much of the leadership and enterprise to reshape the province on these new platforms.

Saskatchewan has a limited number of instruments which it can use to build provincial prosperity. The universities can be two of those instruments. They have done much for the province since 1907 but they are capable of much more, with focus and with the support of the government and the public.

Thus, in my opinion it should be the highest public priority within the province to ensure that the human infrastructure will be adequate to the task ahead. It will not be possible to achieve economic and social goals without a committed, well-educated population. This will require substantial levels of funding with a high priority which is pursued even in years of budget restraint. Maintaining the health of an aging population, although a laudatory goal, should not, in my opinion, become such a preoccupation that the province does not appropriately allocate funds to build its future.

As I see it the province must help to ensure that, in the years ahead, the universities perform their historic roles with even greater vigour, enthusiasm and focus. A strong commitment to a collaborative Saskatchewan university system, working in partnership with the provincial government, has the promise to deliver significant rewards to Saskatchewan through excellence in education and theoretical research, through applied research and economic development, and through a sustained effort to "tap" the university resource to help the province address its economic and social agenda. The universities must not be allowed to drift because of some introspective institutional lethargy or by any perception of public or governmental indifference. A basic premise of any reinforced provincial priority for the universities must be that the universities themselves put forward and implement concrete and progressive plans for their

repositioning. The province can and should, in my view, be a partner in that project. It must provide an environment in which the universities can flourish as respected institutions. Its principal role during the transition period should be to participate in the planning and, in respect of a selected few major repositioning initiatives, to play a role in the funding. Thereafter the government's job should be to maintain the priority attached to post-secondary education and ensure that, to the extent possible, no further unexpected financial shocks are delivered to the university system.

Thus, within the prudent limits of budget flexibility, I urge the government:

1. To rearticulate in very clear terms its commitment to education in general, and the university sector in particular, as crucial building blocks for the province for the 21st century.
2. To establish institutional partnerships with the universities so that they, in cooperation with government, industry, unions and other sectors of Saskatchewan society, are at the cutting edge of the economic and social change which awaits us.
3. To establish collaborative mechanisms with the universities so that, on a regular and systematic basis, there may be clear dialogue at the highest levels, to ensure that the universities' accomplishments and problems are understood by decision-makers and, in like measure, to see that the public agenda is well-known and understood by the universities. Certainly if the universities are to "act in the public interest" and be accountable, public expectations must be made clear.
4. To recognize, through the allocation of resources, the public's responsibility to help maintain, transfigure and build the universities and to do so in a manner which provides incentives to the university community to play its full part in the new relationship. To put it another way, government cannot be expected to fund the universities (by transition infrastructure funding or otherwise) unless the universities themselves accept the primary burden of embracing and enthusiastically managing the change process and do their part to finance it.
5. To work with the universities as they reposition themselves in program matters, leaving the initiative in those matters where it should be, with the universities. In my opinion the government should not be prescriptive in respect of programs unless the university communities prove unable or unwilling to adapt to the new circumstances and respond to the challenges.

The issues for the universities are described earlier in this report. The issues faced by the government may be summarized as follows:

1. How should the universities be prioritized in this period of rapid change for Saskatchewan, recognizing their teaching, research and community service missions? How should this priority be articulated?

2. How much can Saskatchewan afford to spend on its university system, in light of the priority to be afforded to it?
3. How interventionist should government be in reshaping the university system?
4. How should the government make its influence felt in these matters—by legislation, funding conditions or persuasion, or by all three?

COMPETITION OR COLLABORATION

One of the public perceptions of concern to the universities is that each of them is seen to be operating more than it should in its individual institutional self-interest and without meaningful collaboration with the other. Some on the university campuses felt that my Terms of Reference implied that there was no cooperative activity and that, instead, the universities were constantly engaged in a competition for turf in the Saskatchewan post-secondary landscape.

We therefore spent some time assessing the validity of those perceptions. I am attaching as Appendix C documents prepared by the universities which identify a number of initiatives in which there has been significant collaboration between the two institutions. The list, which contains a number of impressive examples of collaborative activity, is self-explanatory and I do not propose to comment upon its details.

Thus, there is certainly no reason to accuse the two universities of insular behaviour on all fronts, to the disadvantage of the province. On the other hand, I was persuaded during the course of my discussions that much remains to be done in developing a fully collaborative approach. The two campuses do not appear to think often in terms of a Saskatchewan university system but independently pursue their institutional missions, separately conceived and all-too-generally articulated. Although it is clear that some useful collaboration is taking place, there remain many opportunities for improved communications and joint action, both on the administrative and the program front, which would better use the province's resources and which would enhance the programs and services made available to the students.

I have expressed the present state of affairs as an opportunity rather than a problem. I think that this is an important difference although these may merely be reverse sides of the same coin. If one were to view the present situation only as a problem (and a problem which has persisted for many years at that) the appropriate remedy could well be argued to be legislatively-imposed separate mandates, supported by sanctions or a compliance-based system of accountability.

Viewed in the other light however, namely as an opportunity, the potential for further collaboration can provide the ground upon which the Boards of Governors, the Presidents, the administrations, the faculty and the other communities at the two universities may take initiatives to better assure the stewardship of public funds and the quality of the Saskatchewan university system. The ideas would be generated from within the university communities themselves.

That was, of course, the premise of my assignment and I describe below the ideas which the universities have generated.

I do want to thank those from the university communities who have participated in the process for the time and interest they invested in the process, particularly during the summer months. Given the objectives noted above, our energies were directed in the first instance to identifying specific opportunities for future administrative collaboration which would achieve cost savings, enhance services or better assure long term university sustainability. Those involved in that task from both universities approached it with enthusiasm and with what I perceived to be a real willingness to identify and act on new ideas for the common well-being of the institutions. As a result, there

are a significant number of targets of future opportunity and, as noted below, some important processes for follow-up and implementation have been agreed.

It is important, however, not to overstate the probable fruits of this future administrative collaboration. While there will undoubtedly be some cost savings, they will not materially resolve the financial pressures which face the universities. Instead, they provide potential for more sustainable universities through collaborative action and the ability to enhance services provided by the universities both to their faculties and to their students.

If the same spirit of common cause thinking can be brought to the program area, much can be accomplished. I would like to address briefly the underlying reasons, as I see them, which have prevented significant program collaboration between the two institutions.

1. Each of the universities is an autonomous institution. Universities everywhere traditionally guard their program array with considerable jealousy. Thus, the absence of sustained program collaboration between the two universities is a natural function of their autonomy and its related governance structures.
2. The institutional missions of the two universities are not sharply defined. Each university does have a mission statement but, in the tradition of mission statements, they are general and vague. Both universities operate without legislative restriction on the scope of what they may do and, hence, they are inclined to see the entire world of university program opportunities as within their legitimate purview.
3. Each of the universities has, since the formation of the University of Regina in 1974, received a fixed percentage of the government operating grant. This has led to the conviction, held by many people on both campuses, that the available provincial financial resources are inappropriately split. This is not an atmosphere in which collaboration is easy. Comment is made on this point below (see below under the heading "Funding Formula Review").
4. To some extent at least, attitudes of competitiveness or distrust, perhaps stemming from the time of the formation of the University of Regina in 1974, have lingered on the two campuses as the large cohort of faculty (many of whom were young professors at the time) has moved through the system to their present positions of seniority.

5. To a significant degree the apparent rivalries of the two institutions mirror and are a product of the rivalries of the cities in which the campuses exist. In both cities there are some who hold the view that gain for one university can only be had at the expense of the other. The broader provincial interest is obscured.

From my discussions I am cautiously optimistic that steps can be taken, and processes initiated, in the present environment which will grow a more collaborative spirit as a product of decisions taken by the two universities themselves. Attitudes of trust and goodwill cannot be imposed by government. They must be spawned and nurtured by the universities themselves, with the well-being of the province and its people at heart.

As noted above, one of the challenges in this exercise will be for the universities to cast off the parochialism of the cities in which they have their principal campuses and instead to view themselves as having, within their spheres of activity, substantial provincial responsibilities. Thus, I would recommend that the government encourage both of the universities to look to the interests of the province, beyond their home city boundaries, as they perform their mandates.

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES AND COLLABORATION

The Vice-Presidents responsible for administration in each of the two universities and their senior officials have assessed a range of administrative activities which are carried out on each campus and the opportunities which exist for significant future joint endeavours. The narrative which follows presents the results of that work grouped in the following order:

1. The development of collaboration, centres of expertise and new initiatives (Appendix D).
2. Procurement (Appendix E).
3. Library initiatives (Appendix F).
4. Information technology (Appendix G).
5. High speed fibre optics telecommunications link (Appendix H).

The proposals of the universities in respect of these matters, and my comments in respect of each, follow:

General Administrative Functions Review

Attached as Appendix D is a report from the two universities in respect of a wide ranging review which has been undertaken of the administrative activities of the two universities in response to my appointment. As indicated in the report, the Vice-Presidents responsible for these activities in each university, and their senior operating staff, have examined intensively most major administrative activities to identify opportunities for the improved use of resources through increased cooperation.

As a result of the work done to date the universities have agreed that three broad areas should be pursued for further in-depth review and implementation:

(a) *Collaboration*

In the first place, the review has demonstrated that there are opportunities for further collaborative activities in a wide range of endeavours ranging from risk management through shared project analysis, contracts and administration in respect of taxes, brokerage and freight forwarding issues. The study identified major procurement and contracting as a specific issue in respect of which opportunities for cost savings through

joint action were probable and a specific program has been proposed to deal with this issue (see below under the heading "Procurement").

(b) *Centres of Expertise*

The study revealed that in certain areas one or the other university has developed ideas or expertise which appear to be more advanced than its counterpart. In these areas, which are identified under the heading "Centres of Expertise" in Appendix D, the universities intend to build upon the existing expertise so as to avoid the other institution having to undergo the same planning process and incur related costs. In other areas the universities will be exploring ways in which they may avoid the duplication of efforts by the long term use of expertise and/or systems already in place at the other university.

(c) *New Initiatives*

Finally, there are important current initiatives underway which are identified under the heading "New Initiatives". In these matters the universities have taken steps to approach the marketplace jointly or have agreed to plan their activities in a collaborative way so that present or future efficiencies may be found. By way of example, both universities are putting in place a system of procurement by which persons on campus with purchasing authority may acquire goods through the presentation of a procurement card, thereby eliminating costly and unnecessary procedures and processes. When our discussions began both universities were in the course of obtaining separate proposals from card suppliers. The universities later coordinated their activities with common vendor presentations to a joint evaluation committee. In addition, they are now considering whether there will be advantages for them to enter into a common contract.

I have been informed by the universities that they now expect to complete their implementation plan by Christmas, 1996 with April 30, 1997 as the target date for implementing changes. In addition, the new formal structures proposed for long term cooperation by the two universities (see the discussion under the heading "Program Collaboration" below) should help to ensure that the initiatives which have been launched in the last several weeks will continue as new opportunities for joint action and/or use of expertise, systems or concepts developed at one or the other of the universities are identified.

Commentary

1. The review which the universities have done in these areas has been productive. There is no doubt in my mind that, with continued focus, many collaborative initiatives to achieve cost savings, better service and other administrative efficiencies should be possible on a continuing basis.
2. To a large degree, the concept that administrative collaboration is a priority in every administrative activity, unless cause can be shown why there should not be collaboration, would ideally become a part of the operating protocol in each of the two universities. This will require a change in the historical practices of the institutions in these areas, where deliberate bi-university collaboration appears often to have been the exception rather than the rule.
3. It will be important for the universities to identify near term specific opportunities and to move them through to successful completion. Successful demonstration projects should demonstrate the value and worth of such collaboration to the university communities.
4. In respect of many administrative issues in which there are significant dollar expenditures, the universities enter into multiple year arrangements with outside suppliers. In respect of these issues, the opportunities for common action will not be immediate but should be taken sequentially as they arise over the near term.
5. I recommend that the government work closely with the universities as they move to the implementation phase so as to assist, where possible, the development of specific action plans.

Procurement

The general review of administrative functions led the universities' senior administrative officers to focus with particular emphasis upon major procurement as a special target of opportunity. The basic idea was to identify those major items of procurement in which a systematic joint approach to the marketplace by the two universities, or more boldly by the two universities and other public institutions with common procurement needs, might generate significant savings.

Collaborative university procurement activity already takes place at several levels. The Canadian Association of University Business Officers ("CAUBO") has put in place a number of umbrella arrangements to which member universities may subscribe (for example reduced rate arrangements in respect of accommodation, rental vehicles, relocation services and travel services). In addition, the Saskatchewan universities are presently able to access some efficiencies in procurement through arrangements with Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. The University of Saskatchewan has, more recently, become involved in a

collaborative initiative in which six public organizations in Saskatoon, which include the Saskatoon District Health Board, the City of Saskatoon, the Saskatoon Public and Separate School Boards and SIAST, are working together to explore common opportunities including certain procurement initiatives in which there is thought to be sufficient community of interest.

Attached as Appendix E is a university document which outlines the universities' ideas in expanding joint procurement and which provides baseline information as to goods and services in which the universities believe there to be opportunities for financial savings or improved service quality through an expanded joint procurement initiative.

During our meetings, we discussed three models for possible enhanced collaboration in respect of procurement:

1. *Targeted joint contracting*

At a minimum, the purchasing departments of the two universities could identify a series of specific initiatives in which they would, using their existing staff and without the formation of a new organization, tender collaboratively in respect of major contracts. In another model of this somewhat less structured type of procurement collaboration, a contracting service could be centralized at one university or a policy could be developed that would ensure that competitive bidding for common use commodities would always include the requirements of the other institution.

2. *The interuniversity umbrella organization model*

We reviewed in detail the history and achievements of a Nova Scotia-based umbrella non-profit corporation, Interuniversity Services Inc. ("ISI"), which provides a joint procurement/contracting function to its member universities in the Atlantic provinces. We also met with the Chief Executive Officer of ISI which, from its beginnings as a joint procurement project of four Nova Scotia universities in 1981, has prospered and succeeded so that its membership has now expanded to include all of the universities in the four Atlantic provinces (17 in number) and one community college. ISI provides two services to its members and a limited number of other users. In the first place it uses the expertise and the power of large volume contracting to put in place, on behalf of its member organizations, contracts against which its members may draw to meet their specific needs. The individual universities and other ISI members, acting through their own purchasing departments, then acquire goods or services under those contracts as required. Secondly, ISI, in certain specialized areas (such as the servicing of microscopes and other technical equipment found on the university campuses), provides a timely and cost efficient service function to its members and other users.

ISI estimates that its members now draw down in excess of \$30 million of goods and services under umbrella contracts negotiated by ISI annually and that these purchases constitute about 20% of the total procurement of non-salary goods and services of the member organizations. New initiatives are taken by ISI on a consensus basis of some or

all of its members. ISI estimates that, on a conservative basis, it has achieved average savings of 15%, after taking into account the additional shared expenses of ISI, for those of its members who are substantial users of the available umbrella contracts.

As noted in Appendix E, one model for collaboration between the two universities would be to establish a Saskatchewan equivalent of ISI. More ambitiously, a prairie equivalent of ISI could be proposed that would include universities both within and beyond Saskatchewan who have common procurement needs, issues and opportunities.

3. *The extended education sector/public sector procurement model*

In the most ambitious approach, an effort would be made to identify a number of common users of a joint procurement service. Other public institutions in Saskatchewan with common procurement needs would be invited to participate as members in the joint effort.

Such an extended organization could, for example, include participants across a broad range of the education sector including the federated colleges at the two universities, SIAST, the regional colleges and perhaps, given the community of purchasing interest which appears to exist throughout the education sector, various school boards throughout the province.

On a broader basis still, the organization could be conceived to provide central administrative services with a view to reducing overall costs and improving procurement services to the health sector, municipal governments and the provincial government as well as the universities and other educational bodies. Such a larger purchasing organization would obviously present still larger volumes and a wider range of opportunities, but could present organizational problems.

The universities are in agreement that a joint procurement initiative should be pursued as a matter of priority. To that end they have agreed to participate in a planning process to evaluate the options for joint procurement and to make recommendations as to the preferred course of action for implementation. Such a study would identify the need and potential savings more clearly, would propose an organizational framework, and would make recommendations as to the target group of members who could, most effectively, initiate the new procurement framework in the first instance. The timetable for this study has not yet been established. There will be many things happening at the universities in the fall of 1996 (including the implementation work referred to above under the heading "General Administrative Functions Review" and the strategic planning, program and budget preparation tasks). In addition, the procurement study is likely, in the opinion of the universities, to entail discussions with other public sector (particularly educational sector) groups or institutions which could benefit as participants in a common procurement initiative. The universities believe that, although some intensified joint procurement can begin immediately, a final decision as to how to optimize procurement will take some additional time—certainly beyond the time frames for the general administrative review work.

Commentary

1. In my opinion there is a compelling argument for this recommended study to be undertaken and, in the final result, for a deliberate program of joint or centralized procurement to be undertaken. The ISI experience has identified the ability of such an effort to achieve substantial savings. Other public and private sector experience also suggests that aggressively pursued large volume procurement can bring significant dividends both as to cost and quality of service. Thus, I support the procurement study initiative as a high priority item.
2. Other educational bodies, such as SIAST, should be encouraged to participate in the planning process so that they may also be architects of the initiatives. The government, as the primary funding agency for these other public sector educational institutions, should strongly urge their participation. In the end, it is important for there to be a buy-in from the participants, ideally from the outset of the planning of the initiative, if the project is to be fully successful.
3. Although it is obviously premature to assess which of the available models for joint action will be found to be preferable, it seems to me that the ISI model provides the greatest opportunities, provided a sufficient number of participants to launch the project may be found.
4. To encourage institutional acceptance, the study and the implementation of the project should be led by the Presidents of the institutions, or their responsible Vice Presidents, who should serve as its steering committee.
5. The intent of the process is not to replace the purchasing departments of the individual participants. However, an effort should be made to obtain, to the extent possible, cost savings both in the contracts themselves and in the procurement function in the participating institutions.
6. The timetable for this project has yet to be established. Because I consider it to be important, I would encourage the government (which may also be able to identify and encourage other prospective participants) to take a lead in establishing and pursuing a realistic timetable.

Library

Attached as Appendix F is a report of the directors of the two university libraries. It indicates that during the course of our discussions the two universities commissioned and completed a detailed internal review to explore opportunities for further collaboration and cooperation between the two university libraries. That study, entitled "Report on Saskatchewan University Library Study and Cooperation" provides an informed analytical framework for further cooperative initiatives in this important area.

Obviously the universities, as institutions which convey and expand knowledge, must have excellent access to knowledge, through their libraries (in the traditional manner) and through the Internet and other modern tools. The quality of a university's libraries, and their care and maintenance through time, lie at the heart of a sustainable institution for both its faculty and its students.

A few remarks may help to put Appendix F in proper context. The University of Saskatchewan has a library system with 8 locations on the campus and a collection of 4.9 million items, and St. Thomas More College also has a small library. The University of Regina began to build its library at a later time than did the University of Saskatchewan and its library resource, though significant, is smaller both for this reason and because the university offers a narrower array of programs, particularly in document-intensive professional areas such as the law school and the medical school. The University of Regina has a collection of 2.3 million items which are maintained in 3 locations on campus. In addition each of the three federated colleges at the University of Regina maintains its own smaller library.

During the recent period of enforced cost control on the university campuses (in light of the declining availability of public funds), library budgets have been under particular pressure,

notwithstanding the wish of those in the university community to protect and preserve the essential knowledge base which the library provides. A few statistics put the library issue into perspective. Since 1986 the unit price paid by research libraries for serials has increased by 138%. The Faxon Canada Price Index, which provides data in respect of prices charged for periodicals, reports an increase of 13.58% in 1996 after an 18.64% increase in 1995. Faxon Canada estimates that price increases for 1997 will be between 9.2% and 12.6%. It will readily be seen that the acquisition costs of vital library resources, which have been heavily impacted by the weakness in recent years of the Canadian dollar, have far outstripped inflation at a time when the universities are under fiscal pressure by reason of declining government support.

The universities in Saskatchewan have responded by trying, to the extent possible, to shelter the library budgets from the full impact of cuts which were imposed upon other expenditures. Thus, at the University of Saskatchewan the library acquisitions budget was maintained from 1994-95 to 1996-97 at a constant dollar level (\$4,992,000). Notwithstanding this, because of the inflationary impacts just noted, acquisitions at the University of Saskatchewan have declined substantially in number. At the University of Regina the library acquisitions budget has been substantially maintained during the restraint period but the same debilitating impact upon actual acquisitions is evident.

In addition to protecting, to the extent possible, the essential library budgets, universities throughout Western Canada have also aggressively pursued a cooperative initiative through the Council of Prairie and Pacific University Libraries ("COPPUL") which is intended, over time, to provide a collaborative information infrastructure among the consortium of its 13 participating university libraries. The objectives and initiatives of COPPUL are described as a part of Appendix F. You will see that among those initiatives has been the establishment of a regional book and archival repository located in Edmonton and operated by the University of Alberta in

which the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary and the University of Regina are key participants.

In Appendix F, the universities make the case for five specific library initiatives. Taken together, they would provide a technological base for the two libraries to cooperatively provide and expand information support infrastructure at the two universities in the future. The initiatives relating to information technology renewal (generally) and the high-bandwidth telecommunications link between the two universities are discussed below in greater detail (see the heading “Fibre Optics Telecommunications Link”). The commentary which follows addresses library issues generally and the other specific library proposals of the universities.

Commentary

1. My Terms of Reference speak persistently to the need for sustainability and quality at the two universities. In my view a high priority must be given to the needs of the two libraries if those two goals are to be achieved.
2. The universities have shown their institutional concern for the libraries, as the heart of their knowledge infrastructures, through their preservation of the library budgets in recent years and through the enhanced interuniversity library cooperation reflected in the COPPUL and the other initiatives described in Appendix F.
3. The suggestions for action made by the universities appear to be reasonable. The attachment notes that the telecommunications link is an essential precondition to the successful sharing of automated library information systems between the two institutions. In addition, the other proposals in Appendix F would establish an infrastructure for collaboration between the two university libraries which would otherwise be problematic.
4. The two universities are leading participants in existing initiatives to create a better integration of Saskatchewan's libraries. The proposals would help them to pursue multi-library initiatives (both within and outside Saskatchewan) which offer much promise.
5. Thus, I recommend that as part of any university renewal package in which the province provides transition funding assistance to build stronger institutions, the needs of the libraries should have high priority. Provincial support should, however, be conditional on the universities providing a specific and detailed action plan and protocol demonstrating the manner in which each initiative will in fact be used to enhance library collaboration within Saskatchewan.

Information Technology

Attached as Appendix G is a commentary setting forth specific proposals by the universities in respect of their information technology systems and opportunities.

Both universities report that they have an adequate technology infrastructure, when compared with other Canadian universities and when assessed in relation to their view of good contemporary university practice. They also make the point that information technology, and its related hardware and software systems, are not ends in themselves but rather are the vital support infrastructure for the universities' activities and programs. Thus, they correctly say, a key question for technology planning is to know exactly what it is that the technology infrastructure at the two universities is expected to support. The answer to that question obviously depends, in part, upon decisions to be made in respect of the reshaping of the universities in the upcoming planning exercises on the two campuses.

Commentary

1. Considerable work has yet to be done within each of the universities to coordinate and standardize, where practical, computer local area network hardware and software applications. Some of the existing differences result from the particular needs of faculty members and others whose disciplines or activities are not well served by standardization but who, instead, require customized hardware or software. Having said that, however, it seems likely that much of the present lack of standardization is rooted in the university's historical practices of devolving procurement responsibility for such items to individual or departmental decisions.
2. Neither university at present appears to intend to significantly refocus its teaching delivery in the near term through increased on-campus use of technology or through a substantial replacement of classes delivered on-campus by technology-based distance education. Thus, there is no perceived need to follow the course set by universities such as Acadia University, which was recently reported as having decided to equip every student desk in the university with a computer terminal and, in addition, to require students to have a personal notebook computer as a condition of study. I was somewhat surprised that the universities were not more aggressive in their presentations in this respect.
3. There is a tremendous concern on both campuses that the universities' equipment renewal policies and related funding are inadequate. As a result, there is a risk that unless something is done the technology infrastructure on the two campuses will gradually become obsolete, along with much of the other vital capital of the universities. More is said of this under the heading "Capital Funding Issues" below. However, in respect of its technological manifestation, the universities estimate that they are on a 7 to 9 year renewal cycle for equipment (rather than the 3 to 5 year cycle which they consider desirable to remain reasonably up-to-date). This is a serious concern which will have to be addressed if the universities are to remain quality institutions.
4. I believe that special attention and priority should be given to the proposals of the universities in Appendix G that (a) there should be "an external review of how technology is applied at the universities and how its funding, use and management can be improved", and (b) funding is required towards the deployment of new administrative systems. In respect of these suggestions:

- (a) In my opinion an external audit of the technological status of the two institutions, in this era of exploding technology, is essential. No detailed strategic technology overview, particularly one with a focus on changing learner needs and on intensifying the use of education delivery (including joint university program delivery) using new technology, has apparently been conducted at either university. This is certainly not by want of interest or vision in those responsible for these crucial areas in each institution but rather, I suspect, because of the restricted funding which has been available on the university campuses for what might be thought (incorrectly in my view) to be discretionary projects. It is likely that the enthusiasm of those on the campuses charged with the technology function to press for new initiatives has waned in recent years as they have had to fight for a share of an ever-shrinking funding resource base. Unless a higher priority for the technological possibilities (in teaching, systems renewal and interinstitutional collaboration) can be established as the strategies and programs of the universities are reviewed and refined, I expect the universities to pay a high price in institutional terms over the long term.

An external review could evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the present technology systems in each of the institutions in their teaching and research support functions. It could present options for technology strategies to address both the needs of the students and the potential for, and implications of,

alternative course delivery mechanisms. It could evaluate how the effective use of technology could create further opportunities for teaching and administrative collaboration between the universities and through their joint or individual efforts in distance education. Finally it could review the manner in which technological applications could retain the competitiveness of the two universities by, for example, permitting new or enhanced alliances with institutions outside Saskatchewan and the marketing of the Saskatchewan university system to students outside the province.

Such a study would unquestionably be a large project which would require significant funding, the enthusiastic participation of the university communities, and a considerable period of time to complete. It would certainly be more ambitious than the workshop proposed by the universities in Appendix G on some of these same issues, although that workshop could provide a valuable platform to assess the wisdom of, and build on the agenda for, a broader strategic technological initiative.

In my opinion, unless issues of the sort described in this section are addressed quickly, effectively and with world-class expertise, neither of the Saskatchewan universities are likely to achieve the goals of long term quality and sustainability described in the Terms of Reference which you provided to me.

- (b) The universities have also proposed, presumably with the objective of achieving cost efficiencies, that new technology-based administrative systems be deployed.

In our discussions, the hypothesis was put that there is a significant opportunity for the two universities to partner with each other, and perhaps with corporate partners based in Saskatchewan with relevant expertise, to study how present paper-based processes and communications could give way, with technological support, to more effective procedures with far less paper. The university administrators believe that there could be substantial cost savings and improved services for both institutions if a thorough study can be done and implemented.

This is also a project which, in my opinion, is important. Such a study should be focused not only at achieving more timely, cost effective and high quality administrative processes on the two campuses but also upon the goal of establishing administrative complementarity, where possible, through common processes and systems at the two universities. Such a systems study would, ideally, proceed in parallel with the technology strategic planning initiative described in the preceding paragraph. Taken together, they would present an informed knowledge base for an intelligent deployment of the resources of the public and the two institutions to build a solid base for the future.

I support both of these proposed strategic planning initiatives. If they are to be undertaken, implementation activities relating to other technology proposals should likely be deferred until the results of the studies, and the available options, are known. To put it another way it would, in my opinion, be shortsighted to make significant new and

increased capital expenditures in respect of technology, except for obviously discrete and self-contained projects the value of which will clearly be realized whatever future directions are taken, until a thorough review of the path ahead is completed.

5. These technology-related projects if implemented will, as noted above, be costly and time consuming. However, in light of their importance, I would recommend that careful consideration be given to the government funding, or at least providing material assistance in respect of the funding of, these significant one-time initiatives.
6. One specific issue not mentioned in Appendix G deserves special note. In September, 1995 the University of Regina acquired the BANNER human resource information management system which will provide a modern and comprehensive information system in relation to those institutions' human resource management activities. SIAST has used that system for several years. The University of Saskatchewan is in the advanced stage of analyzing its human resource information system needs and is assessing its purchase options. In the future many of the post-secondary institutions in Saskatchewan, including the universities, will be acquiring other information systems, including those for financial management applications.

During our discussions it became clear, on the one hand, that there should be long term efficiencies (in planning, in coordinated implementation and in student services) if the

major post-secondary institutions in Saskatchewan systematically procure, maintain, upgrade and utilize common information systems. Recently, for example, the two

universities and SIAST saved approximately \$1,000,000 through the common purchase of an Oracle software license. On the other hand, it was pointed out that the systems selected must meet the functional needs of each of all of their institutional users. There is little logic in implementing common systems as an end in itself unless reasonable functionality can be achieved.

Having weighed the factors as they were discussed with me, I have been persuaded that there will be major long term benefits to the universities and the Saskatchewan public if commonality of information systems can be achieved and maintained. Joint system procurement would likely have very substantial cost benefits and, in addition, there would be an improved framework for management planning and for the provision of services to students. Thus, it is to be hoped that the University of Saskatchewan will take a first important step towards commonality of information systems as it makes its decision in respect of the human resource information management system. It would seem to me that there would have to be very compelling reasons to justify pursuing a separate course.

FIBRE OPTICS TELECOMMUNICATIONS LINK

Appendix H sets forth a proposal of the universities in respect of an enhanced telecommunications link which would allow interactive classroom delivery between the two universities and with other university campuses outside Saskatchewan. This concept, which is also referred to in other attached university presentations (those in respect of the library and

technology generally), is viewed by all to whom I spoke as an essential precondition for the two universities to communicate well with each other and with others.

The attached proposal of the universities makes the case that cooperative planning, lecturing, research and information resource sharing can take place only if there is assured affordable access to a high-bandwidth connection between the two institutions. Such a system is presently in classroom use on an experimental basis between the two universities, utilizing a link provided by SaskTel. It shows great promise but the costs of its commercial application appear prohibitive to the universities.

Commentary

1. I have seen this equipment in action. It is impressive and I agree that every effort should be made by the government, or one of its agencies (such as SaskTel or SCN), to partner with the universities to achieve its commercial availability as soon as possible. I am not in a position to comment upon appropriate long term commercial arrangements. The model suggested by the universities may be the right one (that is to say the three year seed money) but there may well be others which could be explored through negotiations with all interested parties present.
2. In our discussions, the universities suggested that an effort should be made to forge major, multi-topic strategic alliances between the universities, on the one hand, and

technology and other major suppliers (such as SaskTel), on the other hand. The proposed fixed link could be such an opportunity. At the root of this suggestion is the idea that there may be clusters of activities in which the universities have needs, as users, and in which suppliers may be able to benefit through pilot or applied applications of their technology or through research, educational or other partnerships with the university community. Thus, for example, it has been noted that in addition to the need for the high-bandwidth connection noted above, the universities also have ongoing major requirements in respect of such communication matters as Internet access, voice services, dial-in services and campus cards which could be gathered together as a package for strategic alliance discussions with potential suppliers.

I believe that such alliances have considerable merit and I would encourage the government to mandate its Crown corporations, departments and agencies who are potential participants in such ventures to creatively address these new opportunities. It is evident from the details provided in Appendix H that SaskTel is already alert to this opportunity. There will undoubtedly be commercial issues as to its prudence from the point of view of both the universities and the technology supplier. However, in concept, the effort to forge such alliances appears to be worthwhile and to build on Saskatchewan strengths.

PROGRAM COLLABORATION

The discussion of programs is clearly the most contentious, and difficult, topic for the universities as they fulfil their planning mandates.

In my consultations, you asked that we respect the existing autonomy which Saskatchewan universities enjoy in respect of programs. Therefore you instructed me not to be prescriptive vis-à-vis the universities in respect of program issues. The universities have therefore been left to develop their options for program changes in the normal way through the planning and decision-making processes in which each institution will engage during the next several months.

However, we did spend a considerable amount of time during the consultative process in discussing whether the existing mechanisms for consultations between the universities and for discussions between the universities and the government, in respect of program matters and other issues of concern are adequate. It was the consensus that there are indeed gaps, to the disadvantage of the province and the two universities. The universities have developed a proposal, which is attached as Appendix I, to respond to those deficiencies.

Background

Saskatchewan's two universities enjoy greater autonomy in respect of their programs than their counterparts in most other provinces. Thus, for example, unlike most other provinces neither the creation nor the deletion of programs requires any approval from the Saskatchewan government.

The tradition of university autonomy is deeply rooted at the University of Saskatchewan, and has grown as well to be a basic premise of the University of Regina. (See the description of university autonomy in Saskatchewan as explained in Professor Michael Hayden's book, Seeking a Balance: University of Saskatchewan 1907-1982, in which the author emphasizes the importance of university autonomy but also makes the case that autonomy in Saskatchewan has been gradually eroded over the years by reason of government intervention in university affairs).

Notwithstanding this autonomy, the parallel (and on its face somewhat contradictory) tradition of the University of Saskatchewan, again a tradition embraced by the University of Regina, is the commitment of the universities to serve state and community. Throughout the decades the universities have sought out and performed important service to Saskatchewan in topics as diverse as agricultural research and extension, on the one hand, and the development of new models of aboriginal education, on the other. In effect, concomitant with the willingness of the Saskatchewan public to accept and continue the practice of university autonomy has been the continuing ability of the universities to be fully responsive to the society around them, and to have that responsiveness broadly accepted by the public as reality and not rhetoric.

The concept of autonomy is one of the manifestations (although, I would argue, not an essential one) of the narrower idea of academic freedom, i.e. the notion that in a free and democratic society it is important to ensure that scholars are able to teach and critically assess issues and articulate their views without fear of reprisal. In Saskatchewan we have achieved that goal, in part, by leaving the universities to govern themselves in an independent manner and with little or no micromanagement on the part of the government or the broader public. Accountability for public funds has been obtained through somewhat general means (discussed below under the heading “Accountability and the Public Interest”).

Of importance, both the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina have “open charters”—that is to say neither *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995* nor *The University of Regina Act* define the limits of the branches of knowledge or programs which may be pursued at either institution. In effect, the universities are left, using their autonomous, collegial decision-making mechanisms, to define the boundaries of their endeavours from time to time.

An alternative legal regime would be for the Legislative Assembly to replace the present open charters with closed charters, i.e. to establish academic program boundaries (or areas of competence or jurisdiction) within which each of the universities could operate. The consequence of such a limitation would be to make it legally *ultra vires* for the universities to undertake activities beyond those specified by statute. Such an approach would be defensible from a public policy point of view. The universities were, after all, created by the legislature and, hence, they are legitimately subject to such constraints and conditions upon their existence and operations as the Legislative Assembly may prescribe from time to time.

The establishment of separate (and more distinct) statutory mandates would have the theoretical benefit of ensuring that the universities did not offer overlapping or competing programs, except to the extent permitted by their charters. Thus, for example, the statutory mandates could prescribe that University A could offer programs M, N and X whereas University B could offer

programs X, Y and Z. Alternatively, the statutory mandates could specify that one of the universities should concentrate solely on undergraduate teaching whereas the other university should perform a more intensive research role, perhaps with a statutorily-reduced program of undergraduate teaching. Other versions of separate statutory mandates are also possible.

Saskatchewan does not presently have legal structures of this nature for its universities. As noted above, the two universities function with open charters. Although it is interesting to speculate how, in light of the province's present fiscal capabilities, the university turf would in a "greenfield" environment be carved up between two universities, that is not our present reality. We have two *existing* large universities whose scholars and students participate in *existing* program arrays. We do not have the luxury of easily achieving the theoretical goal of pristine "distinct mandates" by legislative means. To do so now would, in my opinion, create chaos and would almost certainly cause severe damage to one or both of the institutions.

On the other hand, the lack of distinctive mandates and the absence of a clear process to define how programs may be created or eliminated (in a way which avoids duplication, in the case of new programs, and a program vacuum to the detriment of the public, in the case of program eliminations) requires an answer in the present context. Again, the question of institutional autonomy must be addressed.

Duplication

One consequence of autonomy is that programs which create, or are perceived by the public as creating, unnecessary duplication may at times be developed at one of the two universities. At a time of scarce resources, any such perceived duplication will, of necessity, bring about criticism of the institutions.

Sometimes that criticism will not be warranted. There is a substantial amount of programming which, by the nature of a university, will be found on most university campuses which strive to meet the traditional goals of effective teaching, research and community service. Thus, for example, one would expect to find well developed programs in English, History, Mathematics and, perhaps these days, Computing Science at most universities. But beyond these core curriculum items, the offerings of a university depend upon the choices made by its scholars as to how to achieve the lofty goals of the university noted earlier.

For the most part it is clear that the Saskatchewan public, through time, has accepted the program choices which have been made by its autonomous universities. From time to time, of course, individual offerings or research projects have come under scrutiny or criticism as being too theoretical or too lacking in direct application, or as being arcane to the point of disinterest to any but the professor and a few of the professor's selected flock. These cases are, however, the exception. In an environment which deliberately fosters creativity their absence would almost certainly signify a loss of vitality.

In any case, questions in Saskatchewan in respect of programs have most recently taken two forms:

1. In the first place, there is the commentary, sometimes made, that the universities have developed too wide an array of programs and specializations. Thus the Johnson Report suggested that the universities, to prepare themselves for leaner times and to maintain or improve their institutional quality, should critically review their offerings and pare them down in the face of the new fiscal realities. The idea behind suggestions of this nature is that scarce resources must find their best use and that enhancements to some programs, to ensure their continued strength, can be made only if decisive steps are taken to narrow the breadth of other offerings. In effect resources must be conserved for their highest and best uses.
2. On another front, attention is brought, from time to time, upon faculties or programs at the two universities which appear, at least by their name, to functionally replicate each other. Specifically, issue is sometimes taken with the fact that both universities offer programs in (a) commerce (styled administration at the University of Regina); (b) education; (c) engineering; and (d) physical education (physical activity studies at the University of Regina). The Johnson Report concluded that the rationalization of these programs by consolidating similar courses of study at one institution would probably not achieve significant cost savings. This conclusion was based on the premise that the students from the discontinued programs would have to be taught in roughly equal numbers in the programs continuing at the other university. The Johnson Report argued that the physical plant and faculty transition costs entailed in any such dislocation would more than offset the savings in eliminating a redundant administrative bureaucracy.

I agree with this conclusion in general terms. However, I think that it may be important to supplement the remarks of the Johnson Report on these questions.

Notwithstanding the problems entailed in rationalizing these programs which were

identified by the Johnson Report, it must be acknowledged that overlapping programs of this nature would, in the hypothetical ideal “greenfield” of the Saskatchewan university system, probably not exist. Had there been distinct mandates in place from the outset, the legislators might well have avoided this duplication. The fact that these programs are presently offered at both universities attests to the demand which has existed for them, both by students and by employers. Although the province is funding parallel programs there are many nuances and divisions of labour between the universities even within these colleges and faculties. The similar or identical names of the colleges or faculties sometimes hide important program distinctions.

All that having been said, the two universities will certainly want to examine these programs very critically in their present planning processes and they should also be assessed in the longer term in the interests of better resource allocation.

I agree with the conclusion of the Johnson Report that closing programs at one university where (a) there is clearly stronger than normal student demand (as reflected, for example, in cutoff grades for admission) and (b) there is strong demand for graduates in the job market, might well as a matter of public policy require a substantial number of spaces to

be opened for students at the other university, thereby offsetting the overall financial benefits of the change. However, where those factors are not so strongly in play I believe that the universities will want to consider the opportunities for program rationalization in respect of these programs. Those efforts could include taking steps to better differentiate the educational products which the two universities are offering (i.e. narrowing programs within the continuing colleges or faculties) and evaluating the closure or combination of colleges or faculties.

This pursuit of complementarity seems to me to be a legitimate objective to be brought into the mix on each campus as its decisions are made. Such a mindset, and broader vision, would demonstrate a respect for the public interest in a time of declining fiscal resources.

I do not want to suggest that the universities have been entirely inattentive to issues such as complementarity and resulting financial stewardship as their program decisions have been made. Examples of successful consultation and resulting collaboration were provided to me. However, my discussions have persuaded me that some real gaps exist in the planning process and in the information base on each campus as to what is in fact going on at the other university. This can lead to significant misunderstandings and to new program initiatives being undertaken with little regard to the long term effect on the university system as a whole. Specific examples of recent program initiatives of this nature came to my attention during our discussion. Because program development naturally occurs in a university at the level of individual departments, senior administrators, university Councils and Boards of Governors do not always have the opportunity to ensure that redundancies or apparent duplications are not inadvertently created.

Similarly, when programs are reshaped or eliminated, there is presently no mechanism to ensure that a void, undesirable in terms of the Saskatchewan public interest, will not be created in the offerings of the university system, as a whole, through the independent action of one of the universities.

Issues and Public Policy Options

In other jurisdictions, some of these same issues have led governments to impose requirements that provincial departments or agencies or, in the case of the Maritime provinces, interprovincial bodies should play a mandatory and determinative role in the approval of new programs or in the termination or rationalization of existing programs. Only in Saskatchewan and, as I am advised, in British Columbia to a lesser degree, is there full institutional autonomy in such matters.

It should also be noted that in most jurisdictions the problems of coordinating program complementarity are, at least theoretically, more significant than in Saskatchewan. In many other provinces there are several universities (in Nova Scotia alone there are 12) and the possibility of effective interuniversity collaboration in such an environment without direct governmental intervention is remote. Saskatchewan, in contrast, has only two degree granting institutions.

The essential question facing the universities and the public, through the government, in respect of programs is whether the status quo of decision-making should prevail or whether the sound stewardship of public funds, at a time of scarce resources, requires prescriptive government action so that, for example, your department's approval would be required before significant program changes of any sort could be made.

Not surprisingly, the universities counsel against such intervention. They note that it would significantly alter the nature of the autonomous university communities which have characterized our province. They contend that this, in turn, could lead the universities to cede public interest considerations solely to the government and that, in the end, the traditions of public responsiveness and service to state would suffer as the universities pursued separate interests, on a short leash of authority from government.

A related question is whether it is desirable (or even necessary) for the government to amend the two universities' incorporating statutes to more formally delineate their mandates either vertically (by carving up the available program universe between the two institutions) or horizontally (by prescribing that there will be two different "types" of universities). Although the universities have conceded (indeed they have urged upon me) that a clearer delineation of their missions would be beneficial, I have not detected an appetite for this to be done by government decree, at least not without an earnest effort by the universities themselves to address this issue. I am sure that they would see any legislative intervention which forced the universities to withdraw from some of their present activities as inimical to the self-governing concept of Saskatchewan university life.

Thus, we have the somewhat paradoxical position that the universities agree that it would be desirable for there to be more sharply articulated "mandates" or "missions" (terms which the universities sometimes appear to use interchangeably) while, on the other hand, they would not like to see the government define these more separate roles. Neither have they found it possible, up to this point in time, to negotiate a clearer separation of their spheres of endeavour. Indeed they have not tried. This, in turn, leads to the dilemma that unless a better negotiating framework can be established and pursued with success, there may well be demands for the government,

through legislation, at some point in the future to make the definition.

This is the background against which the universities' suggestions need to be assessed.

University Proposals

The universities have made the proposals for mission review and program coordination which are contained in Appendix I. In summary, it proposed that two new formal bodies be established to enhance the coordination, cooperation and communication between the two universities, and with the government, both in programming and administrative matters:

- (a) An Inter-University Council is proposed, which would include ten representatives from each university together with two senior officials of your department with a broad mandate to foster communications between the universities and with the government.

The Council would meet semi-annually.

- (b) A University Coordinating Committee is recommended, consisting of three senior representatives of each of the universities and the Deputy Minister of your department, to meet quarterly and to consider and advise the Presidents on the coordination of proposals for existing and new services and for the creation or deletion of degree programs, areas of specialization and other broad subject areas.

The Inter-University Council would, as one of its objectives, encourage and assist the two universities to articulate and pursue distinctive missions that are consistent with the resources available to support them. The work of the University Coordinating Committee would have a similar result. Thus, these new initiatives would endeavour, on a voluntary basis, to fill the mandate definition void which has been left through the open statutory charters.

On a related topic, the universities also propose in Appendix I that a Cabinet-Universities Consultation Committee, to consist of the Premier (or Deputy Premier) and the Minister of Post-Secondary Education and Skills Training, and the Presidents of the two universities, should be established. It would meet semi-annually to discuss matters of public interest as they relate to the universities and their programs, to identify opportunities for service by the universities and to discuss issues of concern to the universities.

Commentary

1. The proposal to establish the Inter-University Council and the University Coordinating Committee holds promise and I recommend that the government participate in their establishment and work.

These bodies would provide, through the discipline of their regular meetings, formal vehicles to maintain focus upon program coordination and complementarity and, through that focus, to achieve greater program distinctiveness at the two universities over a period of time, thus ensuring the effective use of public funds. The Council and the Committee will be established in a voluntary fashion and they will act through powers of persuasion.

As such, the autonomy of each institution will be preserved. On the other hand, it is hard to imagine that either university would pursue overlapping programs in the face of a discussion in one of these bodies which revealed program overlap without evident reason.

2. The Johnson Report had recommended a process for an annual meeting at which the universities, the government and a third independent body knowledgeable of university affairs would meet to discuss university mandates. That suggestion of the Johnson Report was not implemented (nor indeed was the third independent body suggested there established). I believe that the proposal from the universities is more likely to achieve success than the Johnson Report recommendation by reason of its focus and the frequency of meetings.
3. The inclusion of senior representatives from your department at the meetings of the Committee and Council should help to ensure that the government thoroughly understands program development issues. Through the improved communications, your officials should be able to provide the necessary assurance to Ministers that the broader public interest, including the public's interest in avoiding any unwarranted duplication of university facilities using public funds, is being respected.

4. Through the presentation of this proposal, the universities have taken a creative step towards addressing one of the major concerns mentioned to me by those outside the university communities—namely to ensure that program coordination becomes a byword of the Saskatchewan university system every year and not merely an issue which is discussed during a period of an intense public scrutiny, such as that which exists in 1996, and is then forgotten. The commitment of the universities to these new structures should help to address that concern. The worth of these suggestions, of course, will depend upon whether they are effectively implemented. There is, however, no reason to doubt the good faith of the universities. The public will have the means to hold the universities accountable to achieve results in the manner they have proposed.
5. These proposals stop short of providing, by statute or condition of the operating grant, a mandatory government sign-off to program changes, as is the case in certain other provinces. There are some who would urge that now is the time for this greater intervention. However, in my opinion the system proposed by the universities should be given an opportunity to prove itself. It is more consistent with the spirit in which post-secondary education has been conducted throughout the history of Saskatchewan. In a small province such as this, and with a university community with only two members, structures of the sort proposed should be adequate. Of great importance, they avoid unnecessary bureaucratization and government micromanagement.
6. It must be recognized that a sharper definition of the missions of the two universities will be achieved through these new structures only slowly, even if they are effective. It will undoubtedly take good staff work, effective leadership and much discussion for recommendations to come forward. The government may want to consider requesting recommendations in respect of the missions of the two universities within a fixed period of time (say 18 to 24 months).
7. In respect of the universities' proposal for the Cabinet-Universities Consultation Committee, comment is set forth under the heading "Accountability and the Public Interest" below.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In our discussions we have also considered at some length questions relating to the public interest as it affects the universities.

A number of inter-related issues arise. Have the universities historically been responsive to public interest concerns? Should the universities be more attuned to public interest matters and, if so, how is the public interest to be articulated? Can the public or the government fairly complain

about lack of public interest responsiveness if the public interest agenda is never clearly articulated? Who represents the public interest? In a closely related issue, given the dedication of very substantial amounts of public funds in aid of university education, are the techniques for the universities to be accountable for the public funds which are entrusted to them sufficient or ought there to be other tools to ensure that accountability? Are more extensive accountability measures compatible with autonomy and academic freedom?

These issues are the subject of considerable debate across Canada. Some provincial governments, in response, are developing so-called “performance indicators” which are to be designed, ostensibly in a quantitative manner, to measure the responses of the universities in that province to the public interest factors identified in the indicators. Does Saskatchewan need similar controls and, if so, to what end and how would any such indicators be developed, benchmarked, assessed and refined over time?

In our discussions the universities expressed their view that they presently receive public interest input on a regular basis from a number of sources, including the Senates and Boards of Governors of the two institutions. They also point to the extensive present array of reporting, accreditation and review mechanisms through which the universities account to government, to the wider academic and professional community, and to the general public.

Notwithstanding this wide range of contacts, the universities agree that the absence of a formal communications vehicle between the universities, on the one hand, and the government as representative of the public interest on the other hand, is a deficiency in the Saskatchewan context that should be remedied. They consider that this deficiency is an impediment to the universities effectively making their case with government and, in return, being able to be fully responsive on a timely basis to new opportunities for community service. The Johnson Report had proposed that there be formal consultations among senior ministers and representatives of the universities on a mandated formal basis. I understand that, notwithstanding a consensus within the universities and government that this idea had merit, it has not in fact been implemented in a disciplined way.

The universities have reviewed further the Johnson Report recommendation in this respect and have refined the concept in the manner described in Appendix I. The new Cabinet-Universities Consultation Committee, which is proposed in Appendix I, would fill the present formal communications void. In addition, the senior public servant in the province responsible for the university sector would be a participant in the interuniversity coordination activities described in Appendix I so that an additional structured means for regular informed communication would exist.

Commentary

1. The present vehicles for formal communication between the government and the universities appear to me to be inadequate. The university community argues that if it had not been acting in the public interest, the government should have expressed the public interest more clearly before now. What, they say, does government want us to do that we

have not been doing? On the other hand, the universities' governance structures, policy agenda and program decisions sometimes appear to those in government to be designed more to satisfy the self-interest of the university participants than to fulfil the universities' commitment to community service. The uncertainty and suspicion which is sometimes engendered on both sides is, in itself, compelling evidence of the need for improved communications.

2. I have argued elsewhere in this report that, given an appropriate public emphasis, the universities can be an important instrument for progress and prosperity in Saskatchewan. The establishment of the Committee could signal the priority which is attached to the role of the universities and the Committee's working agenda should be shaped with this broad goal in mind.

Unless there is improved communication through a vehicle such as that proposed, major opportunities for the province may be lost simply because the government does not, as often as it could, call upon the universities to help to resolve public policy issues in the provincial interest. The universities' important community service role may not be optimized.

3. The Committee will provide an opportunity for regular informed dialogue between the government and the universities on a broad agenda—including, of course, the universities' education activities (including mandate issues) but also extending to the vital research and community service roles and the Province's objectives as they pertain to these other activities.

To have its greatest impact the Committee must be much more than a working high-level group to discuss post-secondary education. It should be a forum in which broader provincial goals and the universities' role in achieving them may be canvassed.

The establishment of the Committee should, I suggest, be formalized by a protocol detailing the manner in which the consultations would be initiated and continued. There should be meaningful agendas and effective staff work for the joint consultations so that they take on an active and informed working atmosphere rather than being merely an unplanned and free-wheeling discussion forum.

4. Some further thought should be given to the composition of the Cabinet-Universities Consultation Committee. In particular I believe that the Chairs of the Boards of Governors of the two universities should be participants, given the pivotal responsibilities that they have in respect of university affairs. In addition, I would also encourage the Minister of Finance to be a participant in deliberations of the Committee. That Minister's key role in establishing priorities for the use of public funds is obvious. Participation by the Minister of Finance in the Cabinet-Universities Consultation Committee would ensure a continuing focus by both the Minister and the senior officials in the Department of Finance upon the high priority to be afforded, in the broader provincial context, to the university sector.

5. In respect of the accountability of the universities for their stewardship, there can be no question but that the universities, in recent years, have attempted to become more transparent in their operations and to make the Saskatchewan public better acquainted with their activities. This thrust may in part have been simply the natural reaction of a recipient of funds to reach out to those who contribute monies to assure them of the wisdom of their continuing support. In the current environment this requires that the universities not only persuade the public (which, through its taxes, funds the operating grants) but also those individual and corporate supporters, whose contributions are now regularly sought to supplement declining traditional sources of revenue.

However, notwithstanding these efforts, the accountability of the universities to the public still appears to be unfocused and inadequate. The “annual reports” of the universities, delivered to the Legislative Assembly under cover of a letter from the Minister, sometimes consist of no more than audited financial statements. There is no narrative assessment of major accomplishments or problems and no strategic commentary as to the strengths, weaknesses, directions or plans of the universities. By any measure, these reports do not provide the legislators and the public with a reasonable understanding of the health of the university sector or of the public benefits being obtained through the expenditure of public funds. This seems to me to be particularly inappropriate both because of the generous support which the public provides to the universities and the fact that the universities constitute key institutions for progress in the province through their teaching, research and service activities.

In most other fields of endeavour there are well identified vehicles for periodic meaningful accountability to owners or funders. By way of example, the directors and management of a public corporation are required by law to annually present to shareholders and regulators a detailed commentary, through the “Management Discussion and Analysis” report, upon the results of operations and upon the outlook and the issues facing the company. By means such as this, informed debate in respect of a corporation's affairs may be conducted. In my opinion, it would be in the interests both of the universities and the government for an improved mechanism to be developed to present the continuing state of the universities to the Saskatchewan public. The annual grant of more than \$150 million in public funds demands no less.

I recommend that the government work with the universities to develop a new format for the universities' annual reports to the legislature. That format should, at a minimum, provide an opportunity for the universities to explain their problems and opportunities, to account for their continuing stewardship of public resources, and to explain the extent to which the traditional university goals (accessibility, quality of teaching, effective research, relevant community service and the like) and any special public interest needs are being achieved in practice.

The annual report also provides an opportunity for the universities to set out, with some specificity, their objectives (in teaching, research and community service) for the year ahead and to report upon their success in meeting objectives for the year past.

Institutional management by objectives is now well accepted. Good governance, sound financial stewardship and effective results require, in my opinion, that the university sector embrace some of the same criteria.

I also recommend that a forum be provided to the senior members of the university communities in which they could discuss the expanded annual reports in open session with a committee of members of the Legislative Assembly. That kind of two-way dialogue, presented in an environment with full opportunity for media participation, would provide an important vehicle through which on a continuing basis the public priority afforded to the role of the universities could be emphasized. It would better permit the universities to make their case. At the same time, it would allow the public to more clearly see into those sometimes mysterious corners of the universities which have, hitherto, defied comprehension by most outsiders.

Some may argue that even this modest further accountability mechanism may in some way infringe on principles of autonomy. Certainly it may be dangerous to those who feel that the universities' activities, through time, will not be able to stand scrutiny in the bright daylight. I do not, however, believe that to be the case. Surely the public has the right to know whether the institutions which it funds are in fact using the monies provided to maintain themselves as strong institutions of quality and regard in the Canadian university world and to provide continuing services of significant value to Saskatchewan students and to the province generally.

Take, as an example, the question of whether a university college or faculty has encountered serious questions in respect of its continued accreditation through the peer review process. Should there be instances of that sort I would argue that members of the public have a right to know of such issues, not only as the principal funding source but also as the parents and potential employers of the students.

There is a risk that such public accountability could politicize the universities by subjecting their annual reports to the cut and thrust of partisan political discussion. Throughout these discussions I have been impressed by the non-partisan concern which all to whom I have spoken (including representatives of the opposition political parties) have exhibited for the province's universities. I am confident that a forum of the nature I proposed would not be abused.

The format of the annual reports and the forum for their presentation should be developed, if at all possible, by consensus with the universities.

6. Finally, I note again that Saskatchewan is, in population terms, a relatively small province. In my view it should be possible here to effect solid communications and achieve appropriate accountability without bureaucratic structures. In the past such structures were imposed (notably the Saskatchewan Universities Commission which, by statute, exercised a program review function until 1983). Everyone concerned, both in government and in the universities, appears to have applauded the end of that experiment

and there is little stomach for its return. However, the vacuum which has replaced it is not in the public interest.

SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

The universities appear to stand at a crossroads. They may choose to do as little as they can get away with to address their current financial and other problems, to try to survive another year and then, incrementally, to make other decisions on similar premises. In my view such an approach would be suicidal.

The Presidents of both universities have assured me that it is not their intention to debate incrementalist options of this sort but rather to grapple, more fundamentally, in the upcoming months with the major issues which beset the institutions. It appears to be common ground that, without such a forward looking and, where necessary, aggressive approach, the quality of the institutions will deteriorate and that they may not be able to sustain themselves in face of the competitive environment, the declining resources and the learning change realities which surround them.

The preceding commentary contains a number of suggestions by the universities for administrative change designed to position them to be more cost effective (for example through the joint procurement initiative) and to be progressive in their teaching and administration options (through the information technology initiatives). It proposes methods to enhance communications and cooperation between the universities and with government. As already noted, also fundamental to the repositioning will be hard decisions in respect of the program array at both universities to ensure their relevance, quality, affordability and efficiency in the learning context of the 1990's and the century which lies ahead.

It has become apparent in our discussions that three vital issues will have to be addressed to ensure continued quality and sustainability.

- A. A satisfactory solution must be found to the capital maintenance needs of the institutions.
- B. A means must be found to reprofile the demographics of the faculty at both universities so as, at one and the same time, to reduce the size of the faculty, to achieve a more normal age profile within it, and to fit it to the new program array.
- C. Finally, the continuing validity of the historical approach to the funding of the universities by the provincial government should be assessed.

I will deal with each of these important issues in turn.

A. Capital Funding Issues

There is at present no credible, sustained capital funding mechanism for the universities.

Historically, provincial government funds for universities have been divided into an operating grant component and a capital grant component. Typically, the capital grant component includes funding for special large capital projects (principally the construction of buildings such as the Agriculture Building at the University of Saskatchewan and the University Centre at the University of Regina) as well as amounts intended for sustaining capital renewal purposes. Capital grants to the universities in 1993-94, 1994-95 and 1995-96 not allocated to specific projects (and hence available as sustaining capital) totalled, respectively, \$6,050,000, \$9,550,000 and \$4,200,000. The sustaining capital component fell to a recent low of \$1,786,000 in 1991-92, a remarkable figure when one considers that facilities, some of them quite old, with a replacement value in excess of \$1,000,000,000 must be maintained and renewed in a high-tech age.

The universities and your department regularly work together to review the capital funding needs of each institution. This is done in part by applying the so-called modified Stanford formula which would have produced sustaining capital funding requirements for the buildings and equipment of the institutions, taken together, of \$43,860,000 in 1995-96. As noted above only \$4,200,000 was provided in that year.

It is thought by all who have used it that the modified Stanford formula overstates sustaining capital needs. It should not, therefore, be viewed as an appropriate model for establishing a sustaining capital funding program in Saskatchewan. However, the disparity (10:1) between its results and the actual Saskatchewan sustaining capital funding is striking.

The universities propose that consideration be given to restructuring the provincial grants to the universities into three watertight compartments. The operating grant (comments in respect of the formula for its split are noted below under the heading "Funding Formula Review") would be divided into two parts: general operating and operating capital. The latter category of operating capital (which would be available for maintenance, renewal and adaption of buildings, other facilities and equipment) would in this university proposal be subject to the same periodic percentage change as the general operating grant. The separate capital grant would fund one-time initiatives, for example the construction of new buildings and, potentially, provincial assistance for major one-time projects such as an initial upgrade of the technology infrastructure at the two institutions.

The universities' proposal in respect of sustaining capital funding, is attached as Appendix J. It makes the case for the changes mentioned above and outlines a means for institutional accountability for the new category of funds.

Commentary

1. It is axiomatic that if there is to be sustainability in the universities, their plant and equipment must be maintained and renewed in a regular manner in accordance with good practice (in the case of both buildings and equipment) and to be supplied with reasonably current and useable technology (in the case of equipment). The present system of funding

- universities appears to be oblivious to these special long term infrastructure needs. The proposal of the universities would resolve this problem by specifically identifying a tranche of funding dedicated to achieving plant sustainability. Greater accountability could then be had at the universities for this element of their expenditure. In my opinion the establishment of the separate tranche has merit. As the university paper points out, the failure to identify and fund essential renewal of facilities constitutes a decision, conscious or unconscious, to disinvest in university education. As I have noted elsewhere this is a time for intelligent targeted investment in the education of the citizens of tomorrow, not for disinvestment.
2. During recent years, some of these renewal capital needs appear to have been met from the operating budgets of the two universities and, hence, they have been indirectly funded by the province through its operating grants. If the new system is adopted, there will have to be an initial careful assessment of the amount of the existing operating budgets which should fairly be attributed to sustaining capital purposes. In essence, these are the funds which the universities themselves have elected to allocate, on what has certainly been a bare minimum basis, to supplement plant and equipment sustenance otherwise available from the capital budget. An agreed amount, reflecting those expenditures, should be moved from the general operating tranche to the new capital sustenance tranche and, as funds are available, the capital sustenance tranche should be increased to an agreed level at which, through time, sustainability can be achieved. The new system will not therefore free up existing resources for programs.
 3. In this endeavour it will be necessary to determine standards to benchmark acceptable targeted levels of plant maintenance and equipment useful lifetime criteria. Given the province's present fiscal situation this will have to be done on a conservative basis though even that should materially improve the positions of the universities. The universities have also suggested that they be allowed to carry forward funds in this category if they are not spent in a given year but are required in the near term. In my view this suggestion has merit although, of course, a mechanism would have to be found to ensure that the funds are in fact used for their intended purposes within a reasonable period of time.
 4. The basic, and simple, point to be made here is that the universities' facilities, collectively their plant, their equipment and their libraries, constitute one of the three basic pillars to the universities' long term health (the facilities, the faculty and the students). The long term health of the libraries can best be achieved through the upgrading which would be accomplished through the information technology proposals outlined under the heading "Libraries" and through the continued aggressive participation by the two universities in the interjurisdictional initiatives of COPPUL. It should be possible, in the near term, to avoid major capital commitments for many new buildings. However, the essential quid pro quo is that the existing buildings and equipment must be well maintained in the years ahead. This requires a change in the funding mechanism of the government.

5. The extent to which the universities' long term sustaining capital needs should be funded by government (as opposed to the universities themselves) requires negotiation. To the extent that the burden is to remain with the universities, they will have to make adjustments elsewhere in their budgets (perhaps by additional program reductions). The essential point is that someone—government or the universities or both—must fund capital renewal. Without that commitment, there will be no sustainability. However the universities should not assume that the sustaining capital costs will be borne solely or primarily by government. That will have to be a subject for negotiation with the implications for all concerned clearly identified.
6. The capital needs of the two universities will differ in light of the programs which they offer and the age and condition of their physical plant. There will have to be a baseline study to determine the needs of each institution, separately. In addition the criteria for the allocation of sustaining capital between the universities need to be reviewed and updated.
7. I do not agree with the universities' suggestion that the operating capital grant (which I would prefer to style the “sustaining capital grant”) should, once it reaches its full value, escalate or de-escalate pro rata with the general operating grant. Different issues will affect each tranche and the government should retain flexibility.
8. The universities should include in their annual reports their capital renewal plans and an explanation of the success they are achieving in meeting them.

B. *Funding Formula Review*

The essence of the present funding regime is a “block funding” allocation in which the University of Saskatchewan receives 72.7% of the operating grant and the University of Regina receives the remaining 27.3%. The percentage splits have remained essentially unchanged since they were first established by formula allocation in 1974. Those familiar with the development of the formula explain that it factored in, among other things, the relative populations of the universities at the time, the relative costs of programs being offered on the two universities, overhead and physical plant estimates, and the growth on the two campuses which was thought likely.

It is obvious, without saying more, that the criteria which underlie the funding split have changed substantially in the intervening 22 years. Different program arrays characterize the landscape on both campuses. The cost of the science based programs and professional colleges at the University of Saskatchewan may have accelerated faster than the cost of delivery of some of the other programs offered at both universities. On the other hand, the full-time student population of the University of Regina has risen dramatically in relative terms.

With this as background, the universities have proposed in my discussions that there should be a thorough review of the funding formula by an independent expert third party. This is an important joint recommendation of the two universities and I agree with it.

The scope, implementation and results of such a funding study may well prove to be controversial. This is particularly so in light of the widely held views on the two campuses that their interests are not fairly taken into account by the present split.

The University of Saskatchewan argues that the formula operates unfairly to it by not fully recognizing the hyperinflation in its high-tech, high cost programs. On the other hand, the University of Regina believes that the results of the formula, over time, may have skewed the funding split in favour of the University of Saskatchewan by not giving proper regard to the larger percentage growth in full-time students and total enrolment at Regina since the formula was first struck in 1974. Some people at both universities appear to believe, wrongly, that there have been annual adjustments to the percentage splits to take these factors or other matters into account. In fact, the funding formula has not been an evolving concept. It has been a static fixed percentage, applied virtually unchanged year after year from the time it was created to the present date, without regard to the changes which have actually occurred on the two university campuses and other relevant factors.

It is clear to me that the block funding formula is long overdue for careful scrutiny and review. That is not to say that, when the study is complete, there will be significant changes in the overall allocation of funds. To some large degree the factors (noted above) which have increased costs at the two campuses since 1974 may well offset each other. If that proves to be the case there could in the end be little change in the split.

However, in the interests of fair treatment and ensuring the continuing relevance and acceptance of the formula, I would encourage the government to commission such a study. It was noted during the course of our discussions that similar reviews have been done in recent years in the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario and it was thought likely that some of the expertise derived from those reviews would be applicable to Saskatchewan.

I should add that the government should embark upon such a study only if it believes, as a policy matter, that block funding should remain a major component of the Saskatchewan university funding mechanism and that it should not be replaced substantially by other approaches to funding. Obviously if it were to be replaced *in toto*, quite a different scope of study would be required.

The universities prefer to maintain a block funding system. They see it as permitting stability in long term planning and avoiding intrusive government micromanagement of university affairs which may be more likely in some of the other models.

I have not been persuaded, in the limited time available to me during my review to assess this issue, that a radical change in the funding mechanism would be in the interests of the province. Hence, I am inclined to accept the universities' view that block funding should continue to be the rule. If the government agrees with that conclusion, the recommended study of the funding formula makes sense and could proceed without delay.

I can, however, see a case for designating a relatively small tranche of funds (say \$5 to \$10 million) which, on an annual basis, could be the subject of disproportionate grants to the post-secondary institutions whose program directions and other initiatives promise to make a material contribution to important provincial objectives. One of the problems for both universities at the present time is that, in an era of stagnant or declining revenues, it is difficult for universities to find funds for challenging and highly relevant new program activities because to do so requires that room be made in the existing program array and budget for the new initiatives. Thus the response time of the universities may be slow. A fund specially earmarked for such new initiatives would help to solve this problem. It should, in my opinion, be a condition of any such program that the funds provided through it would be available on a limited time basis (say three years) and that there would be a commitment to cofunding by the university (rising from, say, 15% in the first year to 50% in the third year). The university should also commit to absorb the new program into its regular operating budget at the conclusion of the three years. Thus, in effect, a revolving provincial fund for the stimulation of new program initiatives would be provided.

C. *Work Force Adjustment Issues*

As outlined earlier any successful program to reposition the Saskatchewan universities for the 21st century will have to identify ways to adjust the program array (and the supporting faculty complement) to rebalance funding, accessibility and quality and to make room for new program development in the years ahead. That is likely, I believe, to require some downsizing of the two universities and/or an adjustment of teaching loads to increase the student/faculty ratio.

These are not easy challenges. The nature of university governance with its bottom-up collegial decision-making does not lend itself to easy change, even where that change seems to be required. In addition, the reality is that any such change entails the need to deal fairly with faculty members and others whose positions will become redundant.

At the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina, an additional factor affecting the faculty workforce, which may present an opportunity in the present circumstance, is the fact that a high percentage of the faculty is 55 years of age or older. Given the knowledge based enterprise of the universities it is not surprising that most of their operating dollars are used to compensate their human capital. At the University of Saskatchewan 85% of its operating budget is expended on personnel costs; 43% of total expenditures relates to the compensation costs of its academic personnel. At the University of Regina the comparable percentages are 84% (in respect of the entire staff component) and 44% (in respect of the academic personnel).

The universities are considering programs to encourage early retirement among their employees, with particular emphasis upon the possible implementation of transitional early retirement programs for faculty members. Such programs, if successful, would overcome the several problems described under the heading "Saskatchewan Factors, Faculty Demographics" above. The universities have requested that the government consider whether it would be prepared to participate in the funding of such a program and, if so, on what basis.

As noted above, a substantial part of the universities' annual costs relates to the compensation of its faculty. Faculty compensation, although generous in a Saskatchewan context, appears to be average in the competitive marketplace for talented Canadian faculty. The average salary of a full professor at the University of Saskatchewan is \$85,038 (at the University of Regina \$83,384) compared to a Canadian average of \$85,250. The university administrators estimate that other cash compensation items (including pensions, benefits and the like) add an additional 15% to overall faculty cash compensation costs. When applied to the entire complement of faculty on the two campuses (988 at Saskatoon and 305 at Regina) it is immediately evident that faculty regeneration must play a substantial role in the planning on the two campuses if the universities, in the long term, are to conduct their affairs effectively with fewer dollars.

The universities believe that this can best be accomplished by devising and presenting well conceived and relatively generous early retirement packages. The objective of these plans would be to increase the universities' flexibility in making program changes and, in addition, to correct the age bulge in the faculty profile which has been discussed earlier.

The universities propose that the government consider sharing in the cost of these programs, provided that they are designed and implemented in a way which will better assure the long term sustainability of the universities through the effective renewal of its faculty. The administrations at both universities are well advanced in preparing such plans and should be in a position to provide the government with full particulars of the proposed plans shortly.

I would encourage the government to receive this request positively if it can be accommodated in the province's fiscal framework. I believe faculty regeneration to be the immediate core requirement for a successful change process to be initiated on the two campuses.

That having been said, I would caution against government participation in any plan which is not designed with the reasonable probability of achieving the following minimum objectives and meeting the following criteria:

- (a) A very substantial take up from those eligible to participate.

- (b) Government funding participation to be determined on the basis of a contribution of a part of the cost of each early retirement within the program (perhaps on a formula basis to be increased on a per capita basis at higher levels of take up on each campus).
- (c) Assurances from the university in respect of the replacement of retiring faculty members so that a long term adjustment, designed to foster university sustainability, is obtained and that the benefits are not temporary.
- (d) Assurances that the plan will be sufficiently attractive, compared to prior plans, to make it likely to succeed and a commitment on the part of the university that no replacement early retirement plan offering the same or better incentives will be offered within a fixed period (say two or three years) of the final date for applications from those eligible to participate in the 1996 plan (the objective should be to design the plan so that it is clearly a unique opportunity which will not be improved upon and hence one which should be given serious consideration by eligible faculty).
- (e) Confirmation to the satisfaction of the government that the university's overall renewal plan, including its program changes, its faculty profile adjustments and its other components, provides a reasonable assurance that a sustainable long term repositioning, consistent with the resources available to the university, will be achieved.

I also believe that the government should decline participation in such a plan if the university communities themselves do not respond constructively to the need for change on their campuses. This will be evidenced in part by whether they make substantial program change and evidence reasonable flexibility in collective bargaining to accommodate the necessary changes in a fair way.

Appropriate early retirement mechanisms may also have to be developed for some of the other campus work groups affected by program changes and other adjustments. The impact of the changes on these groups will be dependent, in substantial degree, upon the direction taken by the university community in respect of the adjustments. In earlier rounds of fiscal adjustment during the 1990's, the universities appear to have concentrated upon curtailing expenditures in non-program areas with a resulting higher relative rate of non-voluntary job loss among employees outside the faculty. I expect that these groups, which have already been heavily cut, are less likely to be impacted so severely in the next round. However, it will be important that there be appropriate consultation in respect of any necessary adjustment and that an appropriate and fair provision also be made in those instances.

There remain real questions as to whether each university, as employer, and the members of its faculty, in their roles as its employees, will be able to constructively, fairly and creatively address the changed circumstances in which the university finds itself without a

breakdown in labour relations to the great disadvantage of the university, the province and the students.

To the extent that required changes are frustrated or materially fettered by existing provisions of any collective bargaining agreement it is also to be hoped that negotiations may provide solutions which will permit the necessary changes (which are concluded to be in the best interests of the university) to be made in a timely manner and on a basis which is fair to employees but not oppressive or indeed destructive to the university, as employer. Flexibility and reason will be essential.

Some people contend that the collective bargaining agreements in existence at many Canadian universities, combined with university governance structures, will not permit such rational decision-making. They suggest that university faculty are in an inherent conflict of interest as, on the one hand, they are expected to act in the best interests of the university as they deliberate on program decisions (which may entail proposing or endorsing significant program changes or eliminations) and as, on the other hand, they protect their personal interests as employees through their participation as members of the faculty association bargaining unit. Certainly this will be a significant test of the bona fides of the university communities and their ability, when and if conflicts arise, to put self-interest aside in the best interests of their institutions.

Do the present collective bargaining agreements doom any renewal and change process to failure and mean, in the result, that university quality will suffer? If so, the sustainability of the universities themselves will certainly be put in doubt. I think it is too early to make that negative judgment.

For now, the appropriate course for government, in my opinion, is to watch carefully and encourage a flexible and constructive change process through tailored and responsive early retirement assistance plans. Other more interventionist options should be considered, if at all, only if the universities cannot address their fiscal realities in a straightforward manner. Entrenched positions of parties, and the inability to make fundamental change in the face of compelling evidence, should not be permitted to damage the long term health of the university sector in the province.

Properly conceived early retirement programs can be an important element in the universities' repositioning. In particular they could provide a basis upon which to negotiate away from the present complex, cumbersome, costly and difficult to interpret provisions of the collective agreements relating to faculty layoff. Faced with similar problems, some other universities have been able to implement such programs very successfully. It is difficult to imagine that the significant change required at Saskatchewan two universities can be accomplished without such plans.

OTHER UNIVERSITY SUGGESTIONS

During the course of our discussions the universities have also identified three other areas for possible expanded collaborative action.

1. Extension

At the present time both universities pursue extension programs which provide one means by which the universities accomplish their community outreach goals. Extension has been a vital activity of the University of Saskatchewan since its very beginnings and the university recently conducted and published a detailed analysis and review of its extension activities with suggestions as to how the extension function should best serve the university and the province in the time ahead. At the University of Regina, a more modest extension program is pursued with like community involvement objectives. There is at present little formal coordination of the activities of the two universities. The universities have agreed to study whether a more coordinated extension effort would better serve both the universities and the public.

2. Distance Education

The universities have also renewed their commitment to pursue, where practical, distance education opportunities outside of Saskatoon and Regina, using either university credit courses offered in smaller communities through the regional college system with instruction by full-time university professors or sessional lecturers or, alternatively, long distance video technology. During 1995-1996, taken together the universities offered some 500 three credit hour equivalent courses in traditional classroom settings outside the two main cities. In addition, distance education by satellite transmission was available, to a greater or lesser degree, in up to 50 communities offering 26 university credit courses. The Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, in particular, has seized upon distance communication as one way to bring access to the university to aboriginal youth in remote communities, particularly in the far north. The universities are continuing to examine and work with others interested in the future of these initiatives (including technology suppliers such as SCN and SaskTel, and those concerned with the educational opportunities themselves, such as the regional colleges).

There is some disagreement as to the speed at which the universities should pursue initiatives such as these. On the one hand, it is argued that these activities will enhance accessibility to students outside the two main cities who otherwise would not have a chance to obtain a university education for financial or other reasons. In addition it is suggested that if Saskatchewan and its universities do not position themselves to be suppliers of in-home (or at least off-campus) university education, they will lose their position in the competitive, technology-driven university education market which looms. On the other hand, the preparation of high quality courses for delivery by satellite or other technological means is a costly proposition. In addition, detractors argue that televised

distance education provides access only to an impersonal and (by reason of the lack of interaction) far less fulfilling learning experience than its on-campus counterpart.

These debates are not confined to Saskatchewan. Both the government and the province's post-secondary educators must certainly remain carefully attuned to developments and continue to pursue an expanded range of opportunities where, on a case-by-case basis, the initiatives make economic and pedagogical sense. However, I have not been persuaded through my discussions that it would be prudent for the universities, at this time of substantial on-campus planning and positioning, to make radical changes in their program delivery on the premise that a significant part of on-campus undergraduate education will shortly be replaced through a distance education model. Such a change could be premature for the universities. It could require even more on-campus downsizing than would be the case without it. In addition, in an environment of scarce resources it would appear to me to represent a venture whose risks are not warranted by empirical study or experience elsewhere. Already scarce resources might be devoted to an uncertain cause.

In these respects more careful analysis and planning will have to be done. In the meantime, the universities agree that their endeavours in these respects should be coordinated so as to avoid, as new systems develop and expand, overlap and unwarranted duplication. It would be useful to have this commitment reduced to a protocol with your department in which the universities and the government would outline the planning processes and the implementation means by which they would, in partnership, pursue these opportunities.

One last point needs to be made in respect of distance education. One of the hallmarks of our universities is that the on-campus experience for students, in and of itself, represents a substantial part of the learning experience which universities offer. University campuses are, in a way, the stock exchanges of knowledge. Scholars and students from diverse backgrounds meet and, on the floor of the campus knowledge exchange, broker their ideas in sometimes noisy, sometimes reflective, discussion. That environment, which in my view is a crucial underpinning to the success of the universities, simply cannot be replicated in any distance education model. There are, therefore, substantial trade-offs in any proposal to substantially reduce on-campus program delivery for undergraduates and replace it with a decentralized system, whether classroom or technology focused. My personal views remain very much in favour of the on-campus model as the primary undergraduate delivery vehicle in all disciplines and my recent discussions have confirmed this view.

3. *International Initiatives*

The universities also agree that it would be useful for them to work together to market educational opportunities in Saskatchewan to international students. In a rapidly shrinking world students increasingly look beyond the borders of their home jurisdictions for educational opportunities. This is particularly so in the rapidly developing countries of Asia whose university infrastructure is inadequate and where the demand for high quality education cannot be met.

Some Canadian universities have responded by developing programs that are designed to meet the educational needs of developing countries and, at the same time, to subsidize domestic education by providing educational opportunities to international students on a basis which will be fully (or more nearly fully) compensatory to the institutions. As a result, these efforts frequently include differential tuitions for international students. Thus the universities feel they may be able to meet an important global educational need and, at the same time, provide a revenue source to enable their institutions to deliver a wider array of programs to the traditional market than would otherwise be the case.

Both Saskatchewan universities have been participants in these developments. They are now actively considering whether they should expand these efforts and, if so, how such programs should be organized, who should participate, how student recruitment would be undertaken, and how such initiatives would impact on other members of the Saskatchewan public seeking admission to the universities.

These are obviously important public interest questions which will require discussion on the university campuses and in the wider Saskatchewan public as specific possible international initiatives are identified. I endorse the general thrust of this planning activity for the following reasons:

Commentary

1. Saskatchewan's present and future prosperity depends upon open access to growing international markets. Saskatchewan is the most trade-dependent province of Canada with much of our gross provincial product dependant on the export of goods and services. In light of those realities it is crucial for the province and its public institutions to seize every reasonable opportunity to participate in, and to foster, informed international contact. Saskatchewan's young people will profit from the opportunity to meet international students on the Regina and Saskatoon campuses. The international students themselves, once they have returned to their home countries, will undoubtedly retain some knowledge of and empathy for this province and will become bridges to enhanced international contact, commerce and other relationships. Thus, on a conceptual level, the international orientation of Saskatchewan suggests that its universities should take the lead in fostering international educational exchange.
2. At a more pragmatic level, as a province we continue to look for opportunities to expand the range of goods and services which are produced in Saskatchewan and which can therefore support jobs in the province and help build the economy. The marketing of high quality university education can be such an endeavour. I have remarked earlier in this report upon the substantial contributions which the universities make to the Saskatchewan economy at the present time. With the

limits on growth in our domestic market for students, the international marketplace provides an interesting additional avenue to market Saskatchewan expertise and, through that activity, to maintain and extend the economic contributions of the universities to the province.

To approach the educational enterprise in this fashion (i.e. to recognize our ability to reach out and market our expertise in international markets on a cost recovery basis) will, of course, require a substantial change in mindset both within our university communities and in the broader Saskatchewan general public. We will have to identify program niches in which we are likely to have long term competitive advantages in providing such education and in which it therefore makes sense to invest the effort required to successfully undertake international endeavours. We will also have to carefully determine the pricing of such international student packages and we will have to assess and fairly respond to the concerns of those in Saskatchewan who consider that these initiatives may harm their interests.

These initiatives should be pursued quickly or it will be an opportunity lost. Our competitive advantages and positioning will be overtaken by others.

3. Each of the universities is presently active in respect of international student matters, both by the provision of educational experiences within Saskatchewan and by forging links with universities in other countries. Appendix L lists some of those present initiatives. If an effort is to be made to develop still further these international educational opportunities, it will obviously benefit the two universities and the province for a collaborative effort to be undertaken. This would ensure an efficient planning and implementation process, with an ability to share ideas and costs. In addition it would ensure that, in the final result, the two Saskatchewan universities do not compete in international markets for the same niche program opportunities and the same students.
4. Recently a provincial government/private sector partnership, Saskatchewan Trade and Export Partnership ("STEP") was launched with a role which includes export related education and training. I understand that STEP has already been invited to participate in planning meetings relating to the universities' international initiatives. Over the longer term the universities may well be able to provide STEP with assistance in its education and training role and, in that way, open new highly relevant program opportunities to the universities.

The decision of the universities to collaborate in their international activities is an important one which should, in my view, be encouraged by the government.

CONSTRAINTS AND OTHER ISSUES

In the preceding commentary I have outlined the discussion outcomes of the work I have done with the two universities. Specifically I have identified those matters in respect of which the universities propose new approaches which are designed, in one way or another, to facilitate the goals of quality education, cost effectiveness, sustainability and relevance.

I turn now to other matters which have come to my attention during this review and which are, I believe, worthy of comment to you and the government. In particular you asked that I identify constraints or limitations to the successful revitalization of the universities.

1. Speed of Change

The government and the public should understand that it will take some considerable time for the universities to effect these changes.

On the academic side in particular, unless there is government intervention to prescribe specific program changes (which I do not recommend), deliberative “bottom up” decision-making on the university campus is a reality. Not only is it a reality, but it has served the universities, and their funding publics, well over time by ensuring that the course of these knowledge conveying/creating institutions is not subject to kneejerk change at the behest of governments (with their four year electoral cycles) or university administrators (where five year terms are the rule).

Has the process become cumbersome to the point of ineffectiveness in an era of rapid change such as we now have? Is there not too much potential for conflict of interest and self-serving decision-making? As I have mentioned, these questions will be answered by the ability of the two Saskatchewan universities themselves, in the present environment, to embrace change as a virtue, or at least a pressing necessity, and to respond accordingly.

The ability to change quickly is obviously complicated still further where the interests of more than one institution are in play at the same time. The thrust towards more collaboration in the interest of student and community service and of cost effectiveness, which are evident in the appendices to this report, will take some time to achieve. Cooperation by government decree is unlikely to be accepted on the university campuses or to provide a basis for successful implementation. The universities themselves must work through the models of collaboration and act on them in their institutional self-interest and in the greater interest of the Saskatchewan public. That will, in and of itself, take time as it entails both a change of culture and of practice.

Even if the universities take effective individual and collaborative action, in the transition period in which that action is being implemented there will continue to be difficult cost pressures. Decisive program changes may not reflect themselves in concrete savings to the institutions for a period of years. The universities note the obligation they may have

at law, or in any event may feel in practice, to see students presently enrolled through to their degree opportunities notwithstanding the closing of a college. If that hypothesis were accepted, the full benefit of savings would be achieved only after a full cycle through to graduation of the present student cohort (4 to 5 years).

Other provinces which have embarked upon the review and repositioning of their universities have also found that the process takes a considerable period of time. In Nova Scotia, for example, serious study of the university system began in the mid-1980's. A full-time agency dedicated to the task of university renewal, aided by publicly financed task forces and other public and interuniversity study groups, has been at work for more than four years. The most recent plan for rationalization spelled out a seven year time frame for implementation to achieve its stated goals. The point to be made here is merely that Saskatchewan universities will not be able to turn on a dime. It will take time for the new culture and environment, both in academic and administrative matters, to become reality.

In the result, immediate results of change decisions should not be expected.

2. *Adversarial Risks*

From my discussions with individuals and groups on the university campuses, I am concerned that some existing relationships, both personal and institutional, may be barriers to constructive change. It will certainly take the best efforts of the broader university community to prevent old wars and vested interest thinking, and the resulting gamesmanship, from bedeviling the process and its result.

There appears to be a climate of some distrust within the universities. Some believe that Boards of Governors and senior administrators are inconsiderate of legitimate faculty concerns. Others, on the other hand, view positions taken by some of the faculty as short-sighted or self-serving. The growing number of sessional lecturers sometimes feel excluded from the university community and its decisions. Non-teaching employees often see themselves as a forgotten group. Everyone distrusts the government as it reduces its level of funding support.

These "we/they" attitudes are dangerous and counterproductive. New bridges of confidence will have to be built among these various constituencies. Leadership must come from those who have been appointed or elected to guide the affairs of the universities and their constituent groups.

However the government also has a role to play in the improvement of the climate. You will be able to do that, I think, in two ways.

In the first place, government should indicate, by deed as well as words, that it will pursue as a priority a Saskatchewan university system in which traditional autonomy is preserved as far as possible (and in a manner which ensures as much or more autonomy

than that enjoyed by universities in other provinces) unless the university communities act in a way which compels another position. That reaffirmation is important.

Secondly, the government can indicate its bona fides by a clear affirmation of the importance of the universities to the province and a commitment to share in revitalization costs, within the conditions described earlier in this report.

Government could, I believe, in these ways help to create a climate which would encourage the other parties to the result to be constructive, creative and open to change themselves.

3. *Threshold Condition of Sustainability*

The Terms of Reference focus on the expectation that a sustainable university system can be achieved. As I have noted in this report, in my opinion that will require a solid plan by each of the universities to maintain and renew its facilities, a process to ensure that its program array is significantly reshaped to ensure long term quality in light of reduced levels of funding (with the necessary faculty changes), and an emphasis upon enhanced collaboration in administrative endeavours and in program initiatives. Two strong universities, so positioned, should be able to continue to attract, motivate and challenge students from both Saskatchewan and abroad.

However, the universities cannot do the job alone. Both the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina were created at the behest of the Saskatchewan public and they continue to survive with its goodwill and tax dollars. Sustainability involves, on the one hand, the university community taking those steps which it can towards that goal (in the manner I have just mentioned), thus publicly demonstrating its priorities and its willingness to be accountable. On the other hand, it also entails the government clearly providing its commitment to sustained funding, recognizing the economic means from time to time of the province. I recognize that long term assurances of funding can never be provided in absolute dollar terms. However, the articulation and demonstration of the determination of the public (through its government) to adequately finance the university enterprise through time seems to me to be a necessary concomitant of the sustainability goal and indeed of university accessibility itself.

4. *Aboriginal Education*

Debate will no doubt continue as to the future of aboriginal post-secondary education. In particular there are questions as to how best to deliver that education (within a separate degree-granting institution, within the federated college model, or within the broader university context).

Whatever the results of that debate, one thing is absolutely clear. Saskatchewan's future, in economic and social terms, depends upon aboriginal people playing a full role in the

politics and economy of the province and in all of the social interactions of its citizens. For that goal to be achieved education is the first priority.

One has only to look at the existing demographic statistics, fragmentary though they be, to make that assessment. The participation rate of aboriginal youth in secondary education, and particularly post-secondary education, has been dramatically lower than that of their non-aboriginal counterparts. That, however, is slowly changing and that change is, itself, the promise of success in the transfiguration of this important part of our Saskatchewan society. Post-secondary education will provide the leaders and innovators of Saskatchewan's aboriginal community in all fields of endeavour—administration and self-government, business and enterprise, and health, education and social services. A clear mission for Saskatchewan's university system, in the decades immediately ahead, must be to nurture this process.

In the recent past some significant steps to that end have been taken, among them the SIFC growth. That institution has grown from the time of its federation with the University of Regina in 1976 (when there were 9 students) to its present much more substantial role (in the last academic year there were 894 university students enrolled through SIFC). SIFC has been a substantial success as it has opened a First Nations-organized and managed alternative for higher education within Saskatchewan to complement other programs, such as those at the University of Saskatchewan which has, itself, placed a significant priority on aboriginal education and outreach goals in its most recent mission statement.

However, my consultations leave me with the impression that much remains to be done in this field—and some of it may prove not to be popular in the first instance with Saskatchewan's non-aboriginal population.

For example, SIFC presently is funded primarily by the Government of Canada and only to a much lesser extent by the Province of Saskatchewan. This, of course, is rooted in the traditional constitutional responsibilities of the two levels of government. As is often the case when jurisdictional issues intrude, there is the risk that, without a high-priority joint effort on the part of both levels of government, the opportunity for SIFC to grow to meet some of the forecast high demand for aboriginal education, not only within Saskatchewan but beyond its borders, could be lost.

Increased provincial presence in the support of SIFC and other post-secondary aboriginal education programs is, I think, both inevitable and desirable. I emphasize, however, that I make this suggestion to supplement and enrich the ability which SIFC would otherwise have to meet the likely demands upon it in the years ahead. It is important that the province does not simply replace monies provided by the Government of Canada with funds provided by the Province of Saskatchewan. The federal government's responsibility and role in Indian education should not be lost or obscured.

The issue of aboriginal education has many dimensions well beyond SIFC. Should extra provincial focus or support be extended to the University of Saskatchewan as it increases in its aboriginal education initiatives, which are more integrated within the general university community than the SIFC model which is being pursued at the University of Regina? Where do the needs of the Gabriel Dumont Institute and other post-secondary institutions fit? To what extent should the extension and distance education mandates of the universities be tailored in even greater measure to these goals? How does the array of programs available to aboriginal students expand?

I know that many of these topics are well within the view of both of the universities and the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan. However, I have the impression that the project, which is crucial to the province, still lacks definition, coordination and, above all, articulation as a public priority.

I would encourage both universities and the two governments to pursue these matters very aggressively.

5. *Federated Colleges*

During the course of my discussions, I spoke with representatives of most of the federated colleges. Many of them are also continuing to face difficult financial circumstance. In my consultations, we did not address the manner in which these important bodies should fit into the university planning landscape outlined in this report. In my view, it is undoubtedly important that they be participants in the joint procurement initiative. I also believe that, in this period of scarce resources, those responsible for the management and oversight of the federated colleges will have to take a renewed look at integrating their administrative systems with the universities more than they have done in the past, particularly at the University of Regina. The proposed technology and administrative systems study may provide an opportunity to reassess these matters.

6. *Barriers to Change*

The Terms of Reference asked me to identify and report to you upon any barriers to renewal of the province's universities. The significant constraints which have been identified are:

- (1) Attitudinal: The university community, given the fiscal realities, must decide that it is time to accept fundamental changes (including those relating to programs) and the wisdom of collaborative activities between the two universities. As outlined earlier in this report, attitudinal change of that kind will be difficult. I have already addressed the manner in which I think government can do its part to help resolve this constraint.
- (2) Financial: To the extent that the repositioning of the universities requires significant transitional investment (such as that discussed in this report as regards

new technology or the repositioning of the faculty profile), the universities, already stretched financially, do not have the means themselves to effect all of the necessary changes. One could argue that they should be left to their own resources to find those means, perhaps by making even more significant program cuts or other changes. I believe that to adopt this course would risk cutting too deeply into the fibre of these institutions. Thus I have urged in this report the role for government as a cofunder of certain of these major repositioning investments.

- (3) Faculty association collective agreements: The Johnson Report contained an outline of certain of the provisions of the faculty association collective bargaining agreements at the two universities which may make it difficult (or even impossible) to make necessary program changes or which may render it financially impractical for the universities to do so. The Johnson Report noted also that, through the collective agreements, the universities had effectively agreed to diminish the authority of their other governing bodies in respect of the limitation or discontinuation of programs. In consequence the Johnson Report recommended a number of governance changes and observed that collective agreements would have to conform with these restated governance arrangements.

Since that time there have been changes to *The University of Saskatchewan Act* (by the new legislation in 1995). However, the issues outlined by the Johnson Report in respect of the collective agreements have not been fully addressed. The collective agreements may well continue to present constraints to effective university repositioning if they are used to inhibit necessary program changes or if, in application, they erect insurmountable financial barriers.

There are many potential problems which could arise from the language of the agreements. For example, there are provisions which suggest that, at least in some circumstances, layoffs can occur only with the consent of faculty. Other provisions state that some classes of tenured faculty may not be laid off in any circumstances. There are terms which appear to require pro rata layoffs across all faculties (and then on a last hired, first-removed basis). Still others provide notice of layoff periods which make it difficult in time (potentially up to 24 months) and costly in terms of aggregate pay in lieu of notice and/or severance benefits (up to 42 months) to effect faculty layoffs, thereby potentially frustrating necessary program restructuring.

In the growth environment in which they were negotiated, the collective agreements may have been seen by the parties as offering mutually acceptable solutions to foreseeable layoffs. In the present environment, the provisions appear to offer few solutions. Applied literally, they may be so cumbersome, costly and difficult to interpret that there is at best the potential for labour/management disagreements and disputes (to the obvious disadvantage of everyone, on campus and off campus alike) and, at worst, the possibility that the change process at the universities may be ground to a halt.

It is to be hoped that the parties to the collective bargaining process will consider the extent to which their mutual goals are being served by the existing provisions and, where they are not, that they will negotiate revisions that are both practical and understandable.

However, should necessary changes at the universities be frustrated by disputes between management and labour, the government will have to carefully assess whether governance changes of the sort recommended by the Johnson Report, or other measures, should be legislated. It is premature to address such question because the agreements, which read literally may constitute constraints, may well not do so after effective collective bargaining.

(4) Other labour relations issues: During my discussions the universities have drawn to my attention two other labour relations issues which they believe may, to some degree, constrain their ability to deal with their financial realities:

(a) The universities have noted that Section 37.1 of *The Trade Union Act* (which deems the contracting out of certain university services to give rise to successorship rights) and the provisions of the relevant collective agreement inhibit them from outsourcing to suppliers or contractors. Union representatives have expressed the view, with which I agree, that contracting out should not be viewed as a panacea for the financial problems of the universities. They argue that, in some cases at least, contracting out would amount to little more than a shifting of the financial burden of the universities to the workers who provide some of its basic services. While that may be true, there may well be circumstances in which outsourcing would be a prudent course of action and would achieve significant cost savings or service benefits. If that proves to be the case, the government may want to revisit the absolute nature of Section 37.1 of *The Trade Union Act*.

(b) Each of the universities bargains collectively with separate unions with one exception, apparently for historical reasons. When the University of Regina was established in 1974 the government of the day specified, by Order in Council, that there would be a common bargaining unit for a group of workers on the two campuses providing support services. Thus, CUPE 1975 today bargains on behalf of about 1,800 employees, of whom a substantial majority work at the University of Saskatchewan. In respect of some job functions, there remains, after 22 years, a clear community of interest among workers on the two campuses. However, increasingly there are issues which are relevant only to one university by reason of its different programs and other aspects of its culture and life.

The universities raise the question of whether the continued certification of a common bargaining agent at both universities is in the interest of the

universities or the workers themselves. In particular, if there is to be a period of transition as programs are reshaped on each campus and if, as a result, work force adjustment issues come to the fore, the interests of employees at Regina and Saskatoon may well diverge to the point that common bargaining will be difficult or even an impediment to change.

These issues, while important, do not in my opinion threaten the change process to nearly the same degree as the questions surrounding the faculty association collective agreements.

7. *Governance*

I would like to offer a few observations in respect of the governance structure within the Saskatchewan university system. The two universities are incorporated under two separate statutes of the Saskatchewan legislature and there are substantial differences in their formal governance processes. I can see no pressing need to bring them into conformity. However, there are certain observations I wish to bring to your attention in respect of governance:

- (a) Central to the governance structures on both campuses are the respective Boards of Governors of the two universities. In this period of change, the public will undoubtedly look to the university Presidents and the Boards of Governors to provide constructive leadership. The Johnson Report suggested that there could be confusion or difficulty arising out of the roles of the various governing bodies of the universities in the making of fundamental program changes. During this period of financial stress and necessary university repositioning, it is important that there should be no doubt that decisions can be effectively made and implemented. If, during the upcoming months, it becomes apparent that some of the concerns expressed in the Johnson Report are at work, I would encourage the government to clarify the responsibilities and to vest the necessary power with the respective Boards of Governors. In the meantime, the governing bodies of the universities should look to perform their stewardship roles within the present legislative framework.
- (b) At each university, 6 of the 12 members of the Board are appointed by the government. As noted elsewhere in this report those individuals, like their fellow members of the Boards (who are, however, appointed or elected to their positions on a more narrowly structured basis to ensure the representation of particular university constituencies), are expected to represent the broad public interest in the stewardship of the universities and their finances.

At all times, and particularly during these times of major self-assessment and change in the university community, it is essential that the Boards be fully staffed with individuals of significant quality, vision and experience. I do not mean to imply criticism of any of the individuals appointed to the Boards during recent

years. Indeed the qualifications of those who have agreed to serve attests to the fact that it has been possible to attract individuals of substance to dedicate their time and energy to these important roles. I would simply urge the government to continue to ensure that, as vacancies arise, they are filled in a very timely fashion and with individuals of substance. During the period immediately ahead, their opinions and decisions will be fundamental to our universities.

- (c) During my consultations with campus interest groups, a question arose as to whether each of the Boards should include at least one individual who might be considered to be sensitive to, and capable of articulating, the views of the province's workers. This idea, which was advanced by CUPE 1975, struck me as having merit and I urge you to consider it. CUPE did not suggest that such an appointee would necessarily be an employee of the university or indeed a person with any formal attachment to the province's labour movement. The idea, instead, was that the governance process, especially in an era of change, would be enhanced by having at the table of decision-makers, the perspectives of a respected individual with a background on the employee side of the management/labour dialogue. I agree with that assessment. This qualification should, I believe, be borne in mind by the government as appointments are made over time but there ought not to be consultation with labour or any other special interest groups as the appointments are made. Government appointees should continue to represent, as they do now, the public at large.

8. *Student Tuition and Financial Assistance*

During my consultations, both with the universities' senior officers and with representatives of the students, there was a great deal of discussion in respect of the continuing shift of university revenue sources from direct provincial support, through operating grants, to tuition and other student-based revenue. That shift has also seen expansions of student loan and other financial assistance programs, and greater use of such programs by the students themselves, faced as they are with escalating costs. To put these issues in some perspective, 25% of the University of Saskatchewan's operating budget is funded from tuition and other student sources compared to 10% in 1980-81 (28% at the University of Regina now compared to 11.7% in 1980-81).

What does all of this tell us and where are these developments leading? In the first place, there has clearly been a pronounced shift in university revenue sources, particularly during the last decade. In effect, universities across Canada have chosen to protect their present program array at the expense of tuition. Student demand for assistance, as a result, has obliged governments to increase their support for student aid in order to ensure continued university accessibility. In broad terms one form of public assistance to higher education (direct operating grants) has been replaced by another (student loans and other related financial assistance). In addition, students appear to be approaching university education in a somewhat different manner, for example by combining part-time employment with part-time university education rather than pursuing degrees in the more

concentrated traditional way. There are of course many other dimensions to this problem which are well beyond the scope of this report to you.

However I do want to draw your attention to certain conclusions I have drawn from my various discussions, particularly those with student groups on both campuses.

In the first place, students are, with reason, increasingly concerned by the high cost of education. Increased tuition and other on-campus charges, general increases in the cost of living and reduced summer employment job opportunities have combined to create significant financial pressures on university students. These are pressures which continue after graduation as students cope with high levels of debt and early repayment obligations. Unlike some other countries, our tradition in Canada has been to finance university education through a combination of public funds and student self-reliance, rather than to rely upon family support systems, privately-sponsored bursaries and university-administered financial need programs. As direct government support for university education continues to decrease, it will be increasingly important to address the impact of these changes on students. Although some in the university community argue that there is little evidence that higher tuition (at least until this point) has restricted university enrolment in Canada, I believe that there are issues in relation to accessibility, with long term demand implications, for the universities as the trend to a user-pay philosophy continues.

No doubt Saskatchewan's universities will continue to look to tuition for a large (and perhaps an increasing) share of overall operating revenues. In that respect, it is unrealistic to assume that Saskatchewan, in its fiscal circumstances, could afford to replace tuitions with provincial funds more than other Canadian jurisdictions. Thus, I expect that tuitions at the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina will continue to rise in accordance with national trends.

That having been said, there are a number of implications which need to be addressed. In the first place, at what point will increased tuition in fact lead to a substantial impacts on enrolment, and hence produce counterproductive downward utilization of the universities by students? As noted above, there is already some indication that more students are, in order to hold part-time jobs, taking only a restricted number of classes rather than carrying a full class load. What debt capacity can students really be expected to service, even assuming generous student loan provisions? Would, as I am inclined to think, some types of forgivable or income-based repayment plans more equitably meet the needs? How much can Saskatchewan, as a province, expect to participate as the principal provider of funds to its students given the traditional (and continuing) export of substantial numbers of university graduates from the province? Should expanded and coherent national plans be devised?

The shift in financing from grants to tuition also has program and governance implications. As tuition is relied upon to a greater degree, I expect that the students, who create the teaching demand, will want to have a greater voice in what programs are taught,

in the manner in which universities are governed, and generally in the way dollars are spent on campus. This in turn, has implications for the traditional roles of the university because students may be expected to press to have the universities place a greater emphasis upon undergraduate teaching as compared to the research and community service functions of the institutions.

With the financing sources in transition, someone must take the lead in reshaping the options for financial assistance and in leading the governance and other changes which will flow from greater reliance on student funds by the universities. Saskatchewan, which has pioneered in so many other ways, is certainly a logical jurisdiction to champion these causes.

I understand from my discussions with your officials, who have provided me with an interprovincial comparison of student assistance, that Saskatchewan's present student support program compares favourably with others in Canada. Notwithstanding that, much more needs to be done, not I would suggest merely by providing more money but, more importantly, by designing new delivery vehicles.

9. *Administrative Costs*

During the course of my work, some question was raised as to the present administrative efficiency of the two universities. In particular, questions were asked as to whether the universities' present fiscal problem could not be addressed simply by more effective administrative management and the cutting of waste and unnecessary bureaucracy. In this respect the universities have prepared an analysis, attached as Appendix M, which demonstrates their relative efficiency as compared with other Canadian universities.

Of course, the information presented in Appendix M does not include all of the costs of administration at the universities. As mentioned earlier in this report substantial amounts of faculty time are expended in administering their particular program areas. Comparative university data factoring in these additional costs are not available.

I have been provided with statistics which show that there has been a disproportionate curtailment in certain non-academic jobs on the universities during the recent period of fiscal constraint. That has been in part a consequence of the efforts of the universities, until now, to preserve most of their programs and to look for cost reductions in support staff. In addition, the universities have, in some areas, employed people and incurred costs to meet new regulatory requirements or other important policy goals.

Costs related to non-academic personnel will certainly have to be addressed in the present circumstances. However, the universities' analysis in Appendix M makes it clear that the two Saskatchewan universities, in relative terms, continue to be efficient, when compared with their counterparts in other provinces.

That is not, however, to say that improvements cannot be made. There will certainly be the need for the universities, as they make their plans now, to be sure that their administrative offices and support systems are efficient and streamlined.

The proposals for joint action by the two universities in administrative matters contained earlier in this report should be of assistance. In addition, looked at more broadly it would obviously ease the overall administrative costs of the universities if the time devoted to collegial decision-making could be reduced. I have, however, no useful suggestions as to how that could be achieved.

10. *Cost of Program Delivery and Other Data*

For a number of reasons the two universities are unable to readily provide costs on a basis which permits an accurate and easy comparison of the costs of delivering their respective programs. A great deal of data is available at each institution but, in the end, the fundamental problem seems to be that the University of Regina determines its costs on a per credit hour basis while the University of Saskatchewan looks to its costs per student. Given the nature of my work, a detailed examination of these issues and data was not practical or required. However, it is clear to me that it is important for public accountability, and for the universities themselves, to develop cost accounting systems which permit comparability and, through it, better planning and increased efficiency. I would recommend that the government take the lead in a study to determine a mutually acceptable cost comparison system.

Looked at on a broader basis, it seems to me that effective post-secondary planning in Saskatchewan would be materially assisted if there were better data available on a number of relevant subjects. Taken together, a more organized study of enrolment projections and a better understanding of the cost of delivery of programs would facilitate decisions, both by the universities and by government.

11. *Citizen Funding Participation*

It will continue to be costly to ensure excellence and sustainability at the universities. In 1994 the Legislative Assembly passed *The Crown Foundations Act*, pursuant to which Crown agency foundations were established for the benefit of each of the two universities. The concept was that Saskatchewan's citizens and companies, through contributions to the foundations, could obtain full tax deductibility for their support of university education, whereas, without such foundations, there would have been restrictions on deductibility in the income tax system. Monies gifted to the foundations are to be granted to the universities for the purpose of supporting and promoting education and research activities.

Steps should be taken to ensure that *The Crown Foundations Act* is more widely known by the Saskatchewan public. In that way, at a time in which the Province and the universities are emphasizing the priority of the university education, the residents of Saskatchewan may have the opportunity to participate directly in the project of university renewal on a tax-assisted basis.

12. *University Business Plans and Funding Prioritization*

I have made the case in this report for the strategic investment, both by the universities and the government, in repositioning Saskatchewan university education and human resource development.

In earlier sections of this report I have reviewed proposals from the universities, some of which may require government to consider whether it should provide one-time infrastructure revitalization funding. During the course of my review, no effort was made to prioritize these needs although I am sure that the universities view the development of work force adjustment/early retirement programs as at the heart of their requirements. I agree with that analysis but I also believe that further work will have to be done to assess the overall infrastructure renewal needs, to determine the ability of the government to respond, to establish priorities for action and, of great importance, to prepare action plans.

As I have outlined earlier, significant revamping of both the facilities and the faculty will be needed at the front end. Thereafter, both will have to be nurtured on a logical sustained basis. All of that is, in my opinion, in the best interests of the province. I recognize that, in the end, there may have to be a significant infusion of public funds and that this may be difficult for the government to address at a time of continuing fiscal restraint. However, the long term success of these substantial enterprises, and their ability to meet provincial needs, depends upon this infrastructure renewal.

From my perspective, it would be reasonable for the government to impose the following conditions on any government assistance: (a) that the universities themselves take decisive steps towards their successful restructuring, particularly in respect of programs (their post-repositioning budget projections should be able to demonstrate sustainability); (b) that the universities participate meaningfully by appropriate cost sharing of infrastructure renewal in the funding of the transformation, except perhaps for those “big ticket” items (to be determined through further study and negotiation) where it would be appropriate for government to be the sole or principal funding vehicle—for example the technology remake of the institutions; and (c) that there be a determined and successful implementation by the universities of their various proposals for joint action as presented in this report.

No doubt there is a chicken and egg problem here. The universities urge that the government should come forward with the funds and that they will then be able to remake themselves. I, on the other hand, believe it to be preferable for the government's response to the universities' proposals, some of which will be costly, to depend upon the institutions demonstrating their own good management, both on the administrative and academic side.

Consideration could also be given to providing some or all of any government financial support on a loan, rather than a grant, basis.

13. *Interprovincial Cooperation*

Both universities are conscious of the need to pursue academic collaboration not only within Saskatchewan but also with universities beyond its borders. Examples of such activities are described in Appendix C. In addition, during my consultations I was informed of a number of initiatives which are under consideration to expand such opportunities.

There are also some impressive models of cooperation between provinces. For example the Western College of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Saskatchewan represents an initiative of the four western provinces and is funded by them jointly.

It is altogether possible that the universities and the Government of Saskatchewan will have to take steps to expand these extra-provincial linkages as a part of the repositioning exercise described in this report. If Saskatchewan's universities are to build upon their strengths successfully, one way may be to provide access to programs through such means, particularly by an expanded use of interactive video communication program delivery. From the government's perspective, if programs are discontinued at Saskatchewan's universities, there may be areas in which the Province will have to press for access for Saskatchewan students to similar programs at other universities in western Canada. Through such access, and by providing appropriate financial assistance for students participating in such programs designed to ensure their return to the Province, the government can help to ensure that the loss of university program delivery in Saskatchewan does not have, as one of its consequences, the inability of Saskatchewan to staff its essential professions.

Such negotiations will undoubtedly be complex. Universities in other jurisdictions, too, are faced with cutbacks. Opportunities will have to be found in which programs may be retained within the Prairie region through interprovincial collaborative action. I have spoken elsewhere in this report of the difficulties which parochial approaches present to broader thinking. The universities in Saskatchewan have had some difficulty in fully realizing the opportunities for program collaboration within the province and it is likely to be at least as difficult to obtain successful collaboration on an extra-provincial basis.

However, universities everywhere are going through a re-examination of their roles and are endeavouring to build upon strengths and to rationalize programs. Thus, in the period immediately ahead there should be a window of opportunity for successful negotiation on this front that would not have been available in the past.

The Government will have to work closely with the universities as their program decisions are made so as to identify and respond to decisions in which a void must be filled.

14. *Other Post-Secondary Education Issues*

It is important to emphasize that my discussions have related solely to the two universities and not to the other important post-secondary institutions in the province. In Saskatchewan, as in other provinces, their role in the education system has increased substantially in the last two decades.

The universities cannot be looked at in isolation from these other institutions when considering the overall program platform and the administrative mechanisms which will best serve Saskatchewan. That has already been recognized through the creation of the Post-Secondary Advisory Council which was established in 1994. It is clear, as well, from the work that I have done that issues in respect of credit transfer and administrative collaboration extend well beyond the universities. Specific comment in that regard has been made earlier in this report.

The absence of extensive discussion of these other post-secondary institutions in this report is not intended to suggest that their concerns and interests are without significance. My Terms of Reference focused solely upon the universities; my attention has therefore been upon the universities as they fit into the broader post-secondary landscape.

CONCLUSION

Major change is happening everywhere in the university world. The issues faced by the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina have their parallels at most other publicly-funded North American universities. Universities that face their problems and turn from the 20th century to the 21st century, by flexibility and responsiveness in their governance processes and in their program and administrative delivery, will succeed in the century ahead. Those that do not will most certainly fail.

I believe that the ideas contained in this report, and those that may come in the follow-up processes which have been identified, can contribute to the renewal of the Saskatchewan universities so that they may continue to be competitive with those elsewhere and meet important public policy objectives.

Having said this it is evident that there is an enormous amount to do and a relatively short time within which it must be accomplished. Bold and decisive action from the university communities should fairly be expected. It will require both straight talk (from many sides) and much patience to make the change a reality.

I will of course be happy to discuss these matters further with you and your colleagues at any time.

Yours truly,

Harold H. MacKay

APPENDIX A

Saskatchewan's Universities

A Statistical and Narrative Overview¹

Formal recognition of University education in Saskatchewan dates back to April 3, 1907, when the Legislative Assembly passed *The University of Saskatchewan Act*. Shortly after the passage of that Act, in 1909 the University of Saskatchewan began offering undergraduate classes in the College of Arts to a student body totalling 70 in number. By 1926, the University of Saskatchewan had established colleges in Arts, Agriculture, Engineering, Law, Pharmacy, Commerce and Medicine.

Founded as a high school by the General Conference of the Methodist Church in 1910, Regina College was granted a provincial charter in 1911. In 1925, Regina College became an affiliated junior college of the University of Saskatchewan, offering first- and second-year courses in Arts and Science. By 1959 it had become a campus of the University of Saskatchewan and in 1974, it had become a fully independent university.

From relatively humble beginnings, Saskatchewan's universities have developed into significant institutions which impact the economic, social and intellectual life of the province. Today, Saskatchewan's universities deliver instruction to over 30,000 students, both within the respective institutions and across the province through extension activities, and provide full- and part-time employment for almost 7,000 individuals. In order to fully appreciate the size and impact of these institutions, it is necessary to examine their various functions and mechanisms.

I. THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The University of Saskatchewan

The University of Saskatchewan is situated on the South Saskatchewan River within the City of Saskatoon. As the province's fifth largest community during the academic year, the University's utilities and telephone usage is roughly equal to the City of North Battleford. Its site comprises approximately 755 hectares. Of this, 147 hectares are utilized for campus activities, 12 hectares are used for a research park and the rest are used for the University farm and experimental plots. At present, there are 41 university buildings on campus. In addition, 18 affiliated and federated college and other university-related buildings, including the Royal University Hospital, are located on the university campus. The total building area on campus exceeds 420,000 m².

The Food Services department, which is responsible for residence dining, retail food outlets, catering services and vending services, operates ten retail food outlets at various locations on

¹ The statistics contained in this appendix were derived from material supplied by the Universities and are provided to give a sense of the orders of magnitude involved. They are not intended for purposes of detailed statistical analysis or comparison.

campus. The campus dormitories at Voyageur place can accommodate 570 people. The University also owns and runs four high rise apartment buildings, located about five blocks from campus on Cumberland Avenue, which house an additional 627 students.

The University library system is comprised of the main library in the Murray building and seven branch libraries located in the various college buildings. There are approximately 4.9 million items, including 1.597 million printed volumes, 9,767 paid periodical subscriptions, 471,764 government documents, over 2.78 million items in microform and 32,986 slides, recordings, kits, etc. in the library collection. In addition, the University owns and operates a retail bookstore and a computer store, both located in Marquis Hall, which carry a complete stock of books for student use in all courses, as well as computers and accessories, art supplies, and general interest books. The Bookstore also operates three sundries shops which sell stationery supplies, crested clothing and confections.

The physical activity facilities at the University of Saskatchewan include three full-sized gymnasiums, a modern health and fitness centre, two swimming pools, a gymnastics studio, dance studios, tennis courts, a hockey rink, a curling rink and a number of football, soccer and baseball fields, including the University's Griffiths Stadium.

The University of Regina

The University of Regina is located in the heart of Wascana Centre. Just a short distance from the city's downtown, the University's two campuses occupy a total of 152 hectares. Its 20 buildings provide approximately 159,000 square metres of interior space and house 569 classrooms, research labs and teaching labs.

The U. of R. food services consist of two full-service cafeterias with dining rooms and three other outlets located throughout the University. In addition, Campion College and Luther College offer full service cafeterias. College West, the main dormitory on campus, offers accommodation to 342 people and the residences at the Language Institute and Luther College can house up to 281 students at any given time.

The University's library system houses monograph and journal collections of some 2.3 million items, including 887,304 monographs, pamphlets and periodicals, approximately 530,800 government publications, 887,304 other items in microform, as well as a growing collection of maps, records, compact discs, etc. The libraries of the federated colleges, which include Campion College, Luther College and the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, contain an additional 81,900 volumes. A retail bookstore which is open to the public, serves as a supply for textbooks, clothing, supplies, reference and general interest books as well as computers and related accessories.

The University's physical activity facilities include a health and fitness centre, 2 full-size gymnasiums, a swimming pool, an aerobic/dance studio, tennis courts, beach volleyball courts and various playing fields.

II. THE STUDENTS

Numbers and Demographics

Headcount enrolment at the two provincial institutions in 1995-96 totalled 30,523 non-degree, certificate, degree and graduate students.² Overall, in 1995-96 the Universities provided undergraduate degree instruction for 25,857 students,³ graduate degree instruction for 2,728 students and non-degree/certificate instruction for 2,155 students. 10,125 of the undergraduates received instruction from the University of Regina and 15,732 from the University of Saskatchewan. In addition to the large cohort of undergraduate students, there were approximately 860 graduate students at the U. of R.⁴ and 1870 graduate students at the U. of S.⁵ Since the 1992-93 academic year, total headcount enrolment at the universities has decreased from 31,762 to 30,523 a drop of about 4%.⁶ In 1995-96, total headcount enrolment was 11,727 at the U. of R.⁷ and 18,796 at the U. of S.⁸

Traditionally, the student body at the University of Regina has been comprised of a much higher relative number of part-time students than at the University of Saskatchewan—the U. of R. has recently had about 3200 part-time undergraduate students per semester while the U. of S. has had around 2800 part-time undergraduate students.

At the University of Saskatchewan, the distribution of full-time undergraduate students on the basis of sex is about 52% female and 48% male.⁹ At the University of Regina, approximately 55% of full-time undergraduate students are female. On the graduate side, at the U. of R. approximately 57% and at the U. of S. about 64% of full-time graduate students are male.

The average age of full-time, on-campus undergraduate students at the U. of S. is 22.6, while at the U. of R. the average is 23.6. Students in the 18-24 range account for 82.8% of the full-time, on-campus undergraduate population at the U. of S. and 62.6% at the U. of R.

² This figure does not include the 217 post-graduate clinical students at the U. of S. or the 1087 students enrolled in the University Entrance Program (“U.E.P.”) at the U. of R.

³ Of these, approximately 21,195 were full-time students, while 4,662 attended on a part-time basis (blanket totals for the U. of S. and the U. of R.).

⁴ 245 of which were full-time and 611 of which were part-time.

⁵ 1372 of which were full-time and 500 of which were part-time.

⁶ This drop occurred almost entirely at the University of Saskatchewan whose total headcount enrolment dropped from 19,948 to 18,796 during the period from 1992-93 to 1995-96. Over the same period the U. of R.'s headcount enrolment dropped from 11,814 to 11,727.

⁷ This figure does not include the 1087 students enrolled in the UEP at the University of Regina.

⁸ There were, in addition, 217 post-graduate clinical students at the U. of S.

⁹ Part-time undergraduate females outnumber their male counterparts at the U. of S. by a ratio of almost 2:1. No corresponding statistic was available for the U. of R.

Both institutions draw the majority of their students from Saskatchewan. Of the Canadian undergraduate students, approximately 93% of U. of S. students and about 90% of U. of R. students are from within Saskatchewan. Increasingly, however, foreign students make up a growing percentage of the undergraduate and graduate student populations at both universities. For example,

at the University of Regina, students from outside of Canada total approximately 1.3% of the undergraduate student population; at the U. of S. approximately 2.6% of the undergraduate student population is from outside of the country. The numbers of out of country students participating in graduate programs is significantly higher. For example, in 1995-96 34.1% of the graduate student population at the U. of S. was from outside of Canada. At the U. of R. 12.4% of the graduate population came from foreign locations

About 54% of the U. of S.'s first-time, first-year undergraduate students from Saskatchewan high schools are from Saskatoon and its surrounding area and about 21% are from other Northern regions of the province. The University of Regina's catchment area is similarly constituted with approximately 70% of its first-year, first-time undergraduate student population coming from Regina and its surrounding area. The U. of R. draws approximately 87% of its first-year, first-time students from the southern part of the province. It is interesting to note that the two universities each draw only about 3.5% of their respective undergraduate student bodies from the other university's home city.

The Student Unions

The students at both institutions are active in virtually all aspects of the academic and non-academic functions of the universities through their respective student unions. The University of Saskatchewan has two student unions: the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union (the "U.S.S.U."), which represents undergraduate students, and the Graduate Students' Association, which represents all graduate students. The U.S.S.U.'s Constitution describes the U.S.S.U.'s purpose as to "represent the educational, physical, political, and social needs of all students attending the University". In fulfilling this broad mandate, the U.S.S.U. conducts and organizes a wide range of activities which fall into three general categories. First, the U.S.S.U. offers permanent services to students which include the activities of the Programming Centre (cabarets, concerts, speakers, etc.) and of the Print Shop (design and typesetting for publications and resumes, as well as buttonmaking). In addition, the U.S.S.U. funds the Student Help Centre, a Women's Centre and various clubs and student organizations. The university's newspaper, *The Sheaf*, is produced weekly with funding from the U.S.S.U. The U.S.S.U.'s permanent services include services such as copying machines, a housing registry, an exam file, a campus-wide course evaluation and funding of various clubs and camps activities. Second, the U.S.S.U. engages in numerous temporary activities which revolve around current issues facing students. At present, the U.S.S.U. is active in raising with University administration, the government and the public, issues such as government funding, rising tuition costs, employment problems and student aid programs. In furtherance of this role, U.S.S.U. representatives sit on many university committees, including the Board of Governors, the Senate and the University Council. The third main activity of the U.S.S.U. is the direct services provided by the five full-time U.S.S.U. Executive members. Through these elected officers the U.S.S.U. advocates on behalf of students on issues such as tuition, student services and the student's centre, Place Riel. Finally, the executive is responsible for a variety of campus activities including Campus Clubs, U.S.S.U. services and campus communication with students

The University of Regina Student Union (the "U.R.S.U.") is a similarly constituted body at the University of Regina. Like its counterpart at the U. of S., the U.R.S.U. is an autonomous body that represents students to the University, the city and the government. The U.R.S.U. is comprised of a 16 member board of directors which is comprised of 13 representatives, representing each of the University's faculties and the president and vice-presidents academic and administration. The U.R.S.U. acts as a liaison to the Canadian Federation of Students, an organization which offers numerous student services such as the International Student Identity Card, the Studentsaver Discount program, the Student Work Abroad Program, and a travel company called Travel Cuts. In addition, the U.R.S.U. produces the school newspaper, the Carillon, and offers a number of other services including an exam registry, a housing registry, a résumé service, a student advocacy office, a student's handbook, a campus bar, the Lazy Owl, the Students' Union Copy Centre, tutor and typing registries, a used bookstore and The Women's Centre.

Student Support Programs and Facilities

In addition to the extensive food services and residential offerings, both Universities offer a broad array of student support programs including on campus health clinics, student employment centres, day cares, and a variety of physical activity facilities. In addition, both universities offer extensive student counselling services for both academic and non-academic issues. For instance, the University of Saskatchewan's counselling services, which are available to all registered students, offer individual, couple and group therapy to individuals experiencing personal problems as well as individual and group programs to assist students with their academic skills development and career choices. Similar services are available at the University of Regina. In terms of physical and recreational activities, both universities offer numerous physical activity options for their respective students. These include a myriad of intramural sports as well as competitive inter-collegiate sports teams in a number of sports. Comprehensive health and fitness assessments are available at both universities.

Tuition Fees

Possibly the single most important issue facing today's students, tuition fees have increased dramatically during recent years. For example, in constant 1994 dollars, the tuition fees paid by a first year student in the College of Arts and Science at the University of Saskatchewan have gone from \$1,617 in 1990-91 to \$2,525 in 1995-96¹⁰, an increase of 56%. Similar dramatic increases have occurred in all of the other colleges at the University of Saskatchewan as well as at the University of Regina. Indeed, at the University of Regina user fees as a proportion of total university operating revenues rose from 11.4% in 1980-81 to 26.7% in 1996-97. At the University of Saskatchewan, student fees as a proportion of the University's total operating revenue rose from 10% to 25.3% during the same period.¹¹

¹⁰ In non-inflation adjusted dollars the fees have gone from \$1,478 in 1990-91 to \$2550 in 1995-96.

¹¹ It is interesting to note, however, that after a dramatic reduction in the 1970's, present tuition levels at both institutions, as a function of the relative costs of post-secondary education, are roughly equal to levels which occurred in the 1950's.

At present, including all applicable student fees, a full-time student in the College of Arts and Science, Commerce, Education, Engineering, Nursing, Pharmacy and Nutrition, Physical Education, or Physical Therapy at the University of Saskatchewan will be required to pay \$2,786 per year of instruction. Students enrolled in the College of Law are required to pay \$3,053, the Colleges of Dentistry and Medicine, \$4,684 and the College of Veterinary Medicine, \$4,121.

At the University of Regina, in 1996-97 all full time students will be required to pay base fees of \$88.00 per credit hour, or, including student and services fees, \$2784.75 per year. On top of the base fees, students are required to pay course fees which vary from faculty to faculty and range from a low of \$4.50 per credit hour in Administration to \$9.00 per credit hour in the faculties of Engineering and Fine Arts.

III. THE TEACHERS

Like virtually all other universities across Canada, the Universities of Saskatchewan and Regina have been hiring fewer new faculty in the past decade than they did in the expansion periods of the 1960's and the 1970's. This has resulted in a shift of faculty distribution towards older age groups, higher ranks, and longer years of service. The qualifications of faculty have also been rising, with more faculty at the doctoral level than in previous years. The following table illustrates the age breakdown of the full-time academic staff at each institution¹²:

AGE	UNIVERSITY OF REGINA	UNIVERSITY OF SASK.
<30	nil	6
30-39	54	159
40-49	86	352
50-59	121	343
>60	44	128
TOTALS	305	988

Although presently at both institutions the number of female staff at the full professor level is far less than the number of males at the same level, both institutions have recently increased their proportion of women academic staff. The following table shows the gender breakdown at each institution by academic rank:¹³

¹² University of Regina statistics are as of April, 1996. University of Saskatchewan statistics are from the 1995/96 term.

¹³ University of Regina statistics are as of April 11, 1996. University of Saskatchewan Statistics are from the 1995-96 term.

RANK	UNIVERSITY OF REGINA		UNIVERSITY OF SASK.	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Full Professor	116	11	485	36
Associate Professor	73	33	203	86
Assistant Professor	47	23	104	63
Lecturer/Instructor	1	1	3	8
TOTALS	237	68	795	193

Each of the institutions' full-time academic staff are represented by their respective faculty associations, both of which are certified under *The Trade Union Act*.

In addition to the full-time instructional staff, both universities employ a significant number of sessional lecturers on a part-time basis. During the 1995-96 term 258 sessional lecturers were hired on a contract basis to teach 320 classes at the U. of R. In 1995-96 there were 392 sessional lecturers employed by the U. of S.

Academic salaries combine to make up the largest single expenditure of both institutions. For the 1996-97 budget year, academic salaries at the University of Regina totalled \$28,662,000, or 44% of the University's total expenditures. At the University of Saskatchewan, \$74,907,000 will be spent on academic salaries—a total of 43% of the 1996-97 operating budget. The following table illustrates the average annual salaries paid to the various levels of instructors at each institution. The figures do not include fringe benefits such as pension, dental or other plans:¹⁴

RANK	UNIVERSITY OF REGINA		UNIVERSITY OF SASK. ¹⁵	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Full Professor		\$83,384		\$85,038
Associate Professor		\$66,327		\$63,473
Assistant Professor		\$50,995		\$49,402

In addition to the base salary which the universities must pay their academic staff, the cost of fringe benefits such as dental plans, sabbaticals and pension plans exceeds \$10 million for the University of Saskatchewan and \$4 million for the University of Regina.

¹⁴ Statistics are averaged according to rank. Within ranks, salary levels vary according to years of service and program of instruction.

¹⁵ Excluding the Colleges of Medicine and Dentistry.

Compared with other universities in Western Canada, professors at the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan rank in about the middle of the range, with Simon Fraser at the top¹⁶ and Brandon at the bottom.¹⁷

Overall, at the undergraduate level the class sizes and ratio of students to faculty at the University of Regina are smaller. In 1991-92, as part of the background work conducted for the Johnson Report, the Universities calculated the relative student/faculty ratios in comparable colleges and faculties at the two institutions. The results of these calculations were as follows:

COLLEGE/FACULTY	UNIVERSITY OF REGINA¹⁸	UNIVERSITY OF SASK.
Arts and Science		
Fine Arts	11.2	16.4
Arts	20.2	31.8
Science	19.4	29.1
Total	18.6	28.8
Commerce/Administration	23.8	26.7
Education	17.3	30.7
Engineering	11.5	23.9
Physical Education	10.7	12.3

IV. THE SUPPORT STAFF

In addition to the large cohort of academic staff, the two universities provide employment for over 1800 non-academic full-time equivalent employees. Of these, approximately 530 full-time equivalent ("FTE") non-instructional employees are employed at the University of Regina while approximately 1320 FTE non-instructional employees are employed by the University of Saskatchewan. At the University of Saskatchewan there are, in addition, approximately 830 FTE staff employed by the University of Saskatchewan which are supported by research funds.

Certified by an Order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Canadian Union of Public Employees ("CUPE") bargains on behalf of the non-academic, non-administrative staff at both institutions. Administrative staff at the University of Saskatchewan are represented by an independent union, the Administrative and Supervisory Personnel Association ("ASPA").

¹⁶ Simon Fraser's full professors earned in 1995 an average of \$92,143.

¹⁷ Brandon's full professors earned on average in 1995, \$76,995.

¹⁸ The U. of R. attributes some of the difference in ratios between the two institutions to the smaller classrooms and the fewer number of large lecture theatres for use in introductory level classes at the U. of R. In addition, the U. of R. indicates that a large number of students in the faculties of Engineering, Administration and Science at the U. of R. participate in the co-operative education programs, a fact which also reduces the student/faculty ratio. Although no recent statistics are available, the U. of R. reports that its student/faculty ratios have increased in the years since the Johnson Report.

Administrative and technical staff at the U. of R. are represented by the Administrative Personnel and Technical Group (“APT”). Overall, non-academic salaries account for over \$19 million at the U. of R. and over \$52 million at the U. of S.¹⁹ Again, these numbers do not include fringe benefits which the collective agreements provide.

V. THE FEDERATED AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES

Saskatchewan's universities have agreements with four federated colleges: Campion College, Luther College and Saskatchewan Indian Federated College (“SIFC”) at the University of Regina, and St. Thomas More at the University of Saskatchewan. Each federated college is located on the campus of its parent university and is academically integrated with that university but remains financially and administratively distinct. All of the colleges have faculty, staff, libraries, physical plants and courses of study which are open not only to their own students, but also to all eligible students on the university campuses. Federated College classes include the various Arts, Social Science, Science, and Fine Arts courses taught at the universities and also certain distinctive courses and programs which are recognized by the universities. Generally speaking, the Federated Colleges' primary focus is on the instruction of undergraduate students and each places a high priority on student-faculty relations and student services.

Each of the Federated Colleges is financially responsible for its own operations. Funding is based on retaining a portion of student tuition, on government operating grants and on outside income such as gifts from alumni and friends, churches and other resources of the constituency.

SIFC is the only Indian-operated and Indian-controlled accredited university college in Canada. It specializes in courses specific to the needs of the Indian community and is controlled by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations. Many accredited courses are also offered off-campus to students in northern and rural locations throughout the province.

At the commencement of the 1995-96 school year, Campion College's enrolment consisted of 1090 full-time and 170 part-time students while Luther's enrolment consisted of 840 full-time and 91 part-time students. SIFC's enrolment, which includes students registered in SIFC Arts, Education, Fine Arts, Science, Extension and Social Work, totalled 728 full-time and 166 part-time students.²⁰ At the University of Saskatchewan, St. Thomas More's headcount totals about 1130 full-time and 110 part-time students.²¹

The affiliated colleges concentrate primarily on religious instruction leading to a degree in theology. A limited number of their classes may be accepted for credit when a student enrolls at the university with which the college is affiliated. The University of Regina maintains affiliation with the Canadian Theological Seminary/Canadian Bible College. The University of Saskatchewan is affiliated with Central Pentecostal College, the College of Emmanuel and St. Chad, Gabriel Dumont Institute, Lutheran Theological Seminary and St. Andrew's College. St. Peter's, a junior college, is also affiliated with the University of Saskatchewan, offering a range of first- and second-year university courses.

¹⁹ This figure includes salaries paid to ASPA employees.

²⁰ These numbers do not include students enrolled in the University Entrance Program at the U. of R.

²¹ St. Thomas More's students actually register in the College of Arts and Science at the University of Saskatchewan.

VI. THE PROGRAMS

Saskatchewan's universities offer an impressive array of undergraduate and graduate programs. The following is a short synopsis of the major programs offered at the respective institutions:

The University of Saskatchewan

According to its Mission Statement, one of the primary goals of the University of Saskatchewan is to “offer a rich array of challenging academic programs”. Considered a major research university, the University of Saskatchewan presently offers 19 undergraduate degrees in over 80 areas of specialization, 13 graduate degrees in more than 60 disciplines and 11 certificate programs and 2 diploma programs, as well as post-graduate clinical (“residency”) programmes in 11 medical specialties. Of the 11 Canadian medical/doctoral universities, only U.B.C. (17), the University of Alberta (15) and the University of Toronto (15) offer more programs than does the University of Saskatchewan.

Many U. of S. programs include a work experience component. Internships and clinical experience are an integral part of the professional programs in Education and the health sciences; a co-operative program has recently been approved in Agriculture; the Aboriginal Justice and Criminology program includes two practica; and optional internships are offered in Engineering and Commerce.

At the undergraduate level, seven colleges—Agriculture, Arts & Science, Commerce, Education, Engineering, Pharmacy & Nutrition, and Physical Education—currently offer direct entry programs.²² In addition, seven colleges—Dentistry, Education, Law, Medicine (including the School of Physical Therapy), Nursing, Pharmacy & Nutrition, and Veterinary Medicine—offer non-direct entry programmes which require students to have successfully completed a specified number of credit units in designated courses before applying for admission.

1. The College of Agriculture

The College of Agriculture began delivering classes at the University of Saskatchewan in 1912. With an enrolment of 630 full-time and 39 part-time undergraduate²³ and 178 full-time and 19 part-time graduate students, the College of Agriculture offers specializations in Agricultural Biology, Agricultural Chemistry, Agricultural Economics, Agronomy, Animal Science, Applied Microbiology, Crop Science, Environmental Science, Food Science, Horticulture Science, Mechanized Agriculture, Plant Ecology/Rangeland Resources and Soil Science. Four-year Bachelor of Science in Agriculture degrees are offered in all specializations. The College also offers a three-year diploma in agriculture program, and Certificates in Agriculture and Prairie Horticulture.

Focused heavily on science and technology, the College sees its specific roles to include:

- To prepare university students for careers in agriculture, food and environmental

²² Starting in September of 1996, a direct-entry Nursing program is being offered in collaboration with SIAST.

²³ 54% of which are male and 46% of which are female.

science and to foster in these students life-long habits of leadership, innovation, and service.

- To conduct research in agriculture and food at both the basic and applied levels for the benefit of producers, processors and consumers.
- To assist industry and government in fostering economic development.
- To create public awareness of developments in agriculture and food.
- To assist governments in the development of agriculture policies that will lead to prosperity for agriculture, the food industry and the province.
- To assist, insofar as resources permit, developing countries in dealing with food production, processing and marketing constraints.

The average student entering directly from high school into the College has achieved about an 80% senior matriculation average. In 1995-96 the cut-off average for students admitted into the College from high school was 67%.

The annual operating budget of the College of Agriculture is roughly \$7.7 million.

2. The College of Arts & Science

The College of Arts and Science offers three- and four-year Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. In addition, students may graduate from the College with an Honours degree in Arts or Science, or they may receive a Bachelor of Fine Arts or a Bachelor of Music. By far the largest College of the University, both in terms of number of students and variety of course offerings, the College of Arts and Science offers over 40 disciplines of study in 23 departments.²⁴

At the graduate level, the College offers Master's programs in over 20 areas and PhD programs

²⁴ These include: Fine Arts (Studio Art, Art History, Drama, Music), Humanities (Classics, English, French, History, Modern Languages, Philosophy, Religious Studies), Social Sciences (Anthropology & Archaeology, Economics, Geography, Native Studies, Political Studies, Psychology, Sociology, Women's & Gender Studies), Natural Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Geophysics, Mathematics, Statistics, Physics), Interdisciplinary Programs (Ancient History & Classical Culture, Classical & Near Eastern Archaeology, International Studies, Land Use & Environmental Studies, Linguistics, Public Administration, Regional & Urban Development, Environmental Earth Sciences, Food Science and Paleobiology) and an additional four Natural Science majors delivered by Departments in the College of Medicine (Anatomy, Biochemistry, Microbiology and Physiology).

in ten, as well as “special case” programs in areas which do not have a regular graduate program. About 6000 full-time and 850 part-time undergraduate²⁵ and 555 full-time and 50 part-time graduate students are annually enrolled in Arts and Sciences. While accreditation is uncommon in Arts & Sciences, the College presently enjoys accreditation in the four programs for which accreditation is available. Regional & Urban Development recently received a five-year accreditation. The Honours and Advanced programs in Computer Science were accredited in 1992 for five years. The graduate program in Psychology is accredited to 1998. In addition, the Chemistry program has recently applied for accreditation.

The mean senior matriculation average for direct entry students in the College in 1995-96 was 82%. During the period from 1987-88 to 1993-94 the cut-off average for students admitted into the College from High School was, on average, 73%. With the elimination of the quota, however, since 1994-95 all students achieving a senior matriculation average of 65% or greater have been admitted into the College.

The College's annual operating budget in 1995-96 was \$33.7 million.

3. The College of Commerce

The College of Commerce offers a four-year Bachelor of Commerce with majors in Accounting, Development of Information Systems, Business Economics, Finance, General Business, Health Care Administration, Human Resource Management, Marketing and Production and Operations Management. At the graduate level, the College offers a Masters of Business Administration, Masters of Science degrees in Accounting, Finance, Marketing and Human Resource Management. In addition, the College offers Certificates in Business Administration, Health Care Administration and Labour Studies, and an Associate Certificate in Indigenous Business Administration. Each year the College enrolls about 1370 full-time and 160 part-time undergraduate²⁶, 80 full-time and 80 part-time graduate students, and over 1000 certificate students.

The mean high school matriculation average for students entering directly into commerce is approximately 86%. The high school cut-off average for students entering Commerce in 1995-96 was 78%.

The College maintains an annual operating budget of \$4.4 million.

²⁵ Of which approximately 42% are male and 58% are female.

²⁶ About 48% are males and 52% are females.

4. The College of Dentistry

The smallest college on campus, the College of Dentistry has an admission quota of 23 students annually²⁷ and offers instruction to a cohort of about 100 students.²⁸ A single-program college, it offers the degree of Doctor of Dental Medicine. As part of the DMD program, the College operates a dental clinic which provides services to the public at reduced fees. The college has been granted accreditation for seven years (the longest possible); its accreditation is currently in the review process.

With enrolment limitations, competition is intense for acceptance. In fact, on average, the College annually receives approximately 195 “serious” applications²⁹ for the 23 available spots.³⁰

Its annual operating budget is about \$3.0 million.

5. The College of Education

The College of Education enrolls approximately 1600 full-time and 300 part-time undergraduate³¹ and 110 full-time and 230 part-time graduate students. The Bachelor of Education is offered both as a 4-year direct entry program and as a 2-year “post-academic” program, with Elementary/Middle and Secondary streams and a selection of “teaching areas” (mainly Arts & Science areas). At the graduate level, the College offers Master's and PhD degrees and Post-Graduate Diplomas (PGD) in seven areas. A Bachelor of Music in Music Education is also available through the College, as well as Certificates in Methods of Teaching Heritage Languages and Post-Secondary Technical Vocational Education.

The College also offers four special elementary option programs including: Indian Teacher Education Program (“ITEP”), which is designed for aboriginal students; Northern Teacher Education Program (“NORTEP”), which is an off-campus program based in LaRonge jointly offered by the Universities of Regina and Saskatchewan and whose objective is to provide an opportunity for Northern residents, preferably with fluency in an aboriginal language, to become certified teachers; Saskatchewan Urban Native Education Program (“SUNTEP”), which offers courses in Prince Albert and Saskatoon at the Gabriel Dumont Institute designed to assist students to teach aboriginal students in urban centres; and the Northwest Territories Teacher Education Program (“TEP”), which is a three year program leading to a teaching certificate granted by the Department of Education, Northwest Territories.

The average senior matriculation average for students entering the College of Education directly

²⁷ Although, in practice, the College has maintained a quota of 21.

²⁸ Traditionally, the College has been comprised of between 55-60% males.

²⁹ “Serious” represent a short-list of those who possess the necessary qualifications for admittance in to the program.

³⁰ Annually, three first-year spots are reserved for students of aboriginal ancestry.

³¹ About 71% of education students are female.

from high school is about 80%. Although during the period from 1987-88 to 1993-94 the high-school cut-off average ranged from 73% to as high as 79%, all applicants with a 65% senior matriculation average were admitted into the College in 1995-96.

The College's annual operating budget is about \$7.1 million.

6. The College of Engineering

The College of Engineering offers degrees in Agricultural and Bio-resource Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Geological Engineering, Geophysical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Physics. Bachelor of Engineering degrees are available in all disciplines. There are about 1200 full-time and 30 part-time undergraduate³² and about 240 full-time and 50 part-time graduate students enrolled in the College. The College has been granted accreditation for six years (the longest possible); its accreditation is currently in the review process.

The mean senior matriculation average for students entering Engineering from high school is 85%. In 1995-96 the senior matriculation cut-off average was 70%.

The College's annual operating budget is approximately \$10 million.

7. The College of Graduate Studies and Research

All graduate students at the U. of S. are enrolled in the College of Graduate Studies and Research, although they are reported here with the college which houses their area of specialization. PhD programs are offered in over 40 areas and Master's degrees in over 60 areas. Special case programs are available to individual students in departments which do not have a regular graduate program. Post-graduate diploma programs are also offered in most areas. Total enrolment in 1995-96 was 1372 full-time and 500 part-time graduate students. The research activities of the University are discussed below in Section VII, Research.

8. The College of Law

The College of Law was established as the third independent college at the University of Saskatchewan in 1912, with the first students being admitted in the academic year 1913-14. Presently, the College admits 110 students annually and has a total enrolment of about 310 students during any given year.³³ Graduate students total just under 10 per year. The only

³² About 80% of engineering undergraduates are male.

³³ Typically the undergraduate student population in the College is made up of about 53% male students.

degrees offered by the College are the Bachelor of Laws and the Master of Laws. Offering a general array of programs, the College has no formal undergraduate specializations but offers specialized masters programs in Aboriginal Law, Commercial Law, Constitutional Law, Human Rights and Criminal Law.

The University of Saskatchewan Native Law Centre is also affiliated with the College. Established in 1975, the Centre's goal is to promote the development of the law and legal system in ways which better accommodate the advancement of Native communities in Canadian society. The Centre operates the Program of Legal Studies for Aboriginal People, which has facilitated access to legal studies for almost 80% of Canada's aboriginal Lawyers and judges.

The College is a non-direct entry program which requires students to have successfully completed at least two years of undergraduate work. With only 110 spots available in each year, entry into the College is extremely competitive, the College receives about 1000 qualified applications each year.³⁴

The College maintains an annual operating budget of \$2.1 million.

9. The College of Medicine

The College of Medicine was fully accredited in 1957 by the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges, the Association of Medical Colleges and the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association. Connected with the medical building is the Royal University Hospital which operates approximately 420 beds. Its departments are directed by the professional heads of the corresponding university departments. Clinical teaching is also carried out at St. Paul's Hospital and City Hospital in Saskatoon, and at the General Hospital, Pasqua Hospital and the Plains Health Centre in Regina. The undergraduate MD program is fully accredited to 2002. Its post-graduate clinical program is presently in the process of compiling material for an accreditation review in October of 1997.

The student body of the College of Medicine is comprised of 232 full-time undergraduate,³⁵ 217 post-graduate clinical and about 100 full-time graduate students. All undergraduates are enrolled in the Doctor of Medicine (MD) program; at this level, students do not specialize.³⁶ Graduate degrees (MSc, PhD) are available in nine areas including the five basic sciences (Anatomy,

³⁴ It should be noted that due to application processing variations between Colleges, this indicia of demand is not directly comparable to the demand for other Colleges such as Medicine, which pre-screens applications and arrange a short list for interviews.

³⁵ About 51% of these are male.

³⁶ MD students may also concurrently complete a Bachelor of Science in Medicine which focuses on medical research.

Biochemistry, Microbiology, Pharmacology and Physiology) and Community Health and Epidemiology, Pathology, Psychiatry and Surgery. Post-Graduate clinical programs are offered in 11 clinical departments: Anaesthesia, Family Medicine, Medical Imaging, Medicine, Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Ophthalmology, Pathology, Paediatrics, Psychiatry, Rehabilitation Medicine and Surgery.

A non-direct-entry program, the College of Medicine receives numerous applications which are reduced to about 200 serious applications which are then considered for admittance into the 55 available spots in the MD program.

Also funded by the Department of Health, the College receives approximately \$16 million out of the University's operating budget.

The School of Physical Therapy, administratively a part of the College of Medicine, offers a three-year degree of Bachelor of Science in Physical Therapy (B.Sc.(P.T.)) whereby students take two years of pre-physical therapy in the College of Arts and Science and three years in the School of Physical Therapy. At present, the School's undergraduate enrolment consists of approximately 90 undergraduate students, almost all full-time.³⁷ No graduate program is offered in Physical Therapy. The School is presently awaiting the report of an accreditation team who visited the University in May of 1996. It was last accredited in 1986 for a six year period and re-accreditation was extended to accommodate implementation of a revised accreditation process.

Approximately 150-200 students apply annually for the 30 available spots offered by the School of Physical Therapy.

The School of Physical Therapy maintains an annual operating budget of approximately \$373,000, and receives additional funds from the Department of Health.

10. The College of Nursing

Established as a school in 1938, the College of Nursing became a college in 1973. The College provides two programs leading to a baccalaureate degree in nursing:

(1) A four-year program (following a pre-nursing year) leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Nursing (B.S.N.).

(2) A post-R.N. program leading to the degree of B.S.N. which is aimed at practising registered nurses and which is also offered at a number of remote facilities by distance education.

A new co-operative Nursing Education program is beginning in the fall of 1996. This is a direct-entry program jointly offered by the U. of S. and the Kelsey and Wascana campuses of SIAST, leading to either a diploma or a Baccalaureate.

On average approximately 310 full-time and 110 part-time undergraduate³⁸ and 8 full-time and 26 part-time graduate students are enrolled in Nursing.

³⁷ Of which approximately 70% are female.

³⁸ About 87% of which are females.

The non-direct entry, four-year program in the College of Nursing annually receives about 115 serious applications for its 80 available spots.

The College's annual operating budget is approximately \$2.3 million.

11. The College of Pharmacy and Nutrition

The first school of Pharmacy at the University of Saskatchewan was established in 1913. In 1921 the College of Pharmacy came into being and, with the demise of the College of Home Economics, the College became the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition in 1987.

The College of Pharmacy and Nutrition offers a Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy as a non-direct entry program and, through its Division of Nutrition and Dietetics, a direct-entry Bachelor of Science in Nutrition. Both degrees are four year courses. The College student population is roughly 450 full-time and 6 part time undergraduate and 30 full-time and 1 part-time graduate students. Of the undergraduate population, 314 full-time and 3 part-time students are enrolled in pharmacy³⁹ and 140 full-time and 3 part-time students are enrolled in Nutrition and Dietetics.⁴⁰ Pharmacy recently received its first accreditation in 1994 for a seven year term, and Nutrition and Dietetics has also received a seven year accreditation.

The College receives about 240 serious applications annually for the 80 available spots. Nutrition and Dietetics is a direct entry course which attracts students with a mean senior matriculation average of about 79%; in 1995-96 all applicants with a 65% or greater senior matriculation average were admitted.

In 1995-96 the College had an annual operating budget of \$2.1 million.

12. The College of Physical Education

The College of Physical Education offers the degree of Bachelor of Science in Physical Education through a combination of arts and sciences classes, physical education classes and physical education activity courses. Three "study routes" are offered: Leisure and Sport Management Studies, Physical Education Studies and Exercise and Sport Studies. The College enrolls about 350 full-time and 26 part-time students.⁴¹ In addition, there are about 20 graduate students in the College.

³⁹ Males account for about 34% of pharmacy students.

⁴⁰ About 90% of Nutrition and Dietetics students are female.

⁴¹ On average, 57% of Physical Education students are male.

A direct entry program, the mean senior matriculation average for students admitted into the College of Physical Education is approximately 78%. In 1995-96 the cut-off average was the College's imposed minimum 65%.

Its annual operating budget is about \$2.1 million.

13. The College of Veterinary Medicine

Formally known as the Western College of Veterinary Medicine, the College was established in 1963 by agreement among the universities and governments of the four Western provinces. The primary mission of the WCVM is to meet the veterinary needs of Western Canada through education, research and service. To that end, the College operates a Veterinary Teaching Hospital to provide clinical training to students and veterinary services to farmers, veterinarians and the public. At the undergraduate level, the College offers the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) to students from Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories. The course is four years in length (including a year of clinical study) and requires at least two years of pre-veterinary undergraduate study. The College's enrolment is steady at 280-282 undergraduate students, all of whom are full time.⁴² Graduate studies are offered to about 80 students in Herd Medicine & Theriogenology, Veterinary Anaesthesiology, Radiology and Surgery, Veterinary Anatomy, Veterinary Internal Medicine, Veterinary Microbiology, Veterinary Pathology and Veterinary Physiological Sciences. In 1991 the College received a seven-year accreditation (the longest possible).

Annually the College receives about 255 serious applications for its 70 available spots.

The College's operating budget is annually about \$10.1 million. The cost of the College is shared among the four Western provinces; funding from other provinces amounts to \$2.9 million.

The University of Regina

At present, the University of Regina offers 25 undergraduate degrees, 11 master's degrees and 24 certificate programs, as well as doctoral degrees, in 9 faculties.

In addition to its regular courses of instruction, the University of Regina offers co-operative education programs in the faculties of Administration, Science (in Chemistry, Computer Science and Mathematics) and Engineering. Established in 1969 as the first in Western Canada, the Co-Op program combines academic programs with related work experience in a structured work environment. A cross section of the private and public sectors employ co-operative education students. These employers are from across Canada and offer a wide variety of work experiences.

In fact, over 50% of placements are outside the City of Regina. The Co-op programs at the U. of R. are based on the principle that students will develop more effectively in an educational system that alternates academic terms and work periods. According to proponents, students of the Co-op program benefit from their professional work in ways which allow them to acquire skills, self-confidence and maturity in addition to better enabling them to motivate themselves in the classroom.

1. The Faculty of Administration

The Faculty's curriculum objective is to educate students for effective careers in the management of government, non-profit-seeking organizations and business firms. Providing instruction to an annual enrolment of approximately 470 full-time⁴³ and 181 part-time undergraduate students, the Faculty offers the degrees of Bachelor of Administration (4 years) and Bachelor of

⁴² About 63% of Vet-Med students are female.

⁴³ Approximately 53% of which are male and 47% of which are female.

Administration - Co-operative Education designation (4 years, 8 months) as well as the diploma of Associate in Administration. The faculty offers instruction in accounting, finance, marketing personnel and industrial relations, production and operations management and public policy and administration. Masters of Business Administration and Public Administration are also awarded annually by the faculty. Typically, about 10 full-time and 65 part-time students are enrolled in the MBA program at the U. of R.

At present Administration is the only non-direct entry program at the University of Regina. The Faculty typically receives about 350 to 380 applications for its 260 to 285 available spots.

For the year ending April, 1995, the Faculty's operating expenditures totalled slightly under \$2.5 million.

2. The Faculty of Arts

The Faculty of Arts offers instruction in 19 areas of study in the social sciences⁴⁴ and humanities⁴⁵. The Faculty offers a Bachelor of Arts, a Bachelor of Arts Honours, an Arts Certificate (1 year), a Bachelor of Arts in Journalism and Communications (4 years), a Bachelor of Journalism (2 years after degree), a Baccalauréat en études franco-canadiennes, a Certificate in French as First Language (1 year), a Certificate in French as a Second Language (1 year) and a Certificate in Indian Communication Arts (2 years). In addition, the Faculty of Arts offers pre-professional programs in a number of disciplines including, medicine, dentistry, law, nursing, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, physical therapy, optometry, occupational therapy, and chiropody. The Faculty's enrolment totals approximately 1100 full-time⁴⁶ and 308 part-time undergraduate and around 90 full-time and 130 part-time graduate students each semester. In addition, the total enrolment in the Arts and Science programs taught by Campion, Luther and the Saskatchewan Indian Federated Colleges is about 1600 students.⁴⁷

The mean senior matriculation average for students admitted into the Faculty of Arts is approximately 77%. The high-school cut-off average for students entering Arts in 1995-96 was the Faculty's minimum 65%.

The Faculty's annual operating budget is approximately \$10 million.

Contained within the Faculty of Arts, the School of Journalism and Communications is the only undergraduate journalism program in Western Canada. The School offers a broad education in all media—print, radio and television. With a limited enrolment, there is considerable competition for the 26 available spots. In 1995-96 the School received approximately 150 applications for admission.

⁴⁴ Areas of study include: Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Indian Studies, Journalism, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Social Sciences, Social Studies, Women's Studies.

⁴⁵ Areas of study include: Cree Linguistics, English, French, German, Ojibway Linguistics, Philosophy, Religious Studies.

⁴⁶ Of which approximately 43% are males and 57% are females.

⁴⁷ These figures are broken down as follows: Campion Arts (698 FT, 118 PT), Luther Arts (448/20), SIFC Arts (350/35).

A separate entity which is affiliated with the Faculty of Arts, the Language Institute has been, since its establishment in 1988, committed to the provision of increased opportunities for adult post-secondary study and professional French language training for French and English speaking residents of Saskatchewan. Although focused primarily on French language and English as a Second Language instruction, the Language Institute is also responsible for operating the Saskatchewan Centre for International Languages (the “SCIL”) which serves students, business people and government employees in delivering university accredited, intensive courses in international languages.

3. The Faculty of Education

The Faculty of Education offers 5 four-year degrees, including: Baccalauréat en Education (Elémentaire ou Secondaire) Français, Bachelor of Education (Elementary or Secondary), Bachelor of Elementary Education (Indian Education), Bachelor of Music Education and Bachelor of Vocational/Technical Education as well as an after-degree Bachelor of Education and Certificates in Extended Studies and Vocational/Technical Education. In addition, the Faculty offers a five-year, two-degree course whereby students can receive a Bachelor of Education and a Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics, French or Arts. The Faculty has an enrolment of approximately 775 full-time⁴⁸ and 233 part-time undergraduate and about 20 full-time and 330 part-time graduate students each semester.⁴⁹

Notable features of the Faculty of Education include:

- In-school experiences are integrated with on-campus studies at introductory, pre-internship and internship levels.
- Two-semester pre-internships maximize support by peers and faculty in personal and professional ways.
- A full semester of internship, including the Internship Seminar for co-operating teacher and intern pairs, is actively supported by the teachers and school administrator seminar leaders, school divisions and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation.

In addition to the courses offered by the Faculty, Education programs are also offered by the SIFC which teaches approximately 65 full-time and 6 part-time undergraduate students each year. The Faculty also sponsors jointly with the University of Saskatchewan, the Northern Teacher Education Program (“NORTEP”) and, with the Gabriel Dumont Institute, the Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (“SUNTEP”).

The mean senior matriculation average for students admitted into the Faculty of Education is approximately 80%. In 1995-96 the high school cut-off average for students applying into the faculty was 65%.

⁴⁸ Of which approximately 27% are male and 73% are female.

⁴⁹ SIFC provides instruction in its Faculty of Education for about 65 full-time and 6 part-time undergraduate students.

The 1995-96 operating expenditures of this faculty totalled \$5.6 million.

4. The Faculty of Engineering

The Faculty of Engineering at the University of Regina offers four programs leading to the degree of Bachelor of Applied Science. The Faculty of Engineering curriculum focuses on a systems approach to engineering. U. of R. system engineers design, analyze and manage complex networks of interrelated components. The areas of study offered within the Faculty include: Electronic Systems, which concentrates on the design, analysis and application of electronics and control systems; Industrial Systems, which concentrates on the analysis, design and operation of industrial facilities, equipment and processes; Regional Environmental Systems, which teaches students to plan, design and manage public engineering services such as water resource management and transportation networks; and Software Systems Engineering which deals with the systematic design, production and maintenance of software products. Many of the students enrolled in the Faculty of Engineering take advantage of the successful Co-op program which has become an integral part of the Faculty's identity. In 1994 the Faculty received six-year accreditation from the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (the longest term possible).

Approximately 400 full-time⁵⁰ and 130 part-time students are, on average registered in the Faculty of Engineering. In addition, there are approximately 30 full-time and 72 part-time graduate students enrolled in the faculty.

The senior matriculation entrance average for students in the Faculty has recently been in the low to mid 80% range. The 1995-96 high school cut-off average for students applying for admission into the faculty was 70%.

The Faculty maintains an annual operating budget of approximately \$2.6 million.

5. The Faculty of Fine Arts

The Faculty of Fine Arts offers four-year bachelor degrees in Arts, Arts (Honours), Fine Arts, Music and Music Education, and a 2 year certificate in Visual Arts.⁵¹ In addition, the Faculty offers a Film and Video production program which is unique in Western Canada.

⁵⁰ Of which, approximately 79% are male and 21% are female.

⁵¹ The 23 areas of study in this faculty include: Art History, Ceramics, Dramatic Theory, Dramaturgy, Drawing, Film and Video, Film Studies, Indian Art, Indian Art History, Instrumental Performance, Music Composition, Music Education, Music History, Painting, Printmaking, Sculpture, Stage Management, Theatre Crafts and Costume Design, Theatre Performance, Theatre Set and Lighting, Visual Arts and Vocal Performance.

The University of Regina believes arts and culture industries, as Canada's fourth largest employer, have an important role to play, not only in Canada but also in the global economy and social fabric. Continuing shifts in Canadian lifestyles and the increased priority placed on the arts by the Canadian public are making arts and culture one of the fastest growing industries in Canada and North America. Coincident with this forecasted growth the University of Regina's new University Centre Building, which will house many of the Fine Arts facilities, is slated to open in 1997.

The student body of the Faculty of Fine Arts is presently comprised of approximately 200 full-time⁵² and 35 part-time undergraduate and 5 full-time and 8 part-time graduate students. In addition, there are about 85 full-time and 70 part-time students enrolled in Campion Fine Arts, 25 full-time and 22 part-time students enrolled in SIFC Fine Arts and 40 full-time and 7 part-time students enrolled in Luther Fine Arts.

The mean high school entrance average into the Faculty of Fine Arts has recently been approximately 77%. In 1995-96 the cut-off for students applying for admission into the faculty was 65%.

This faculty's annual operating budget is approximately \$3.7 million.

6. The Faculty of Physical Activity Studies

This Faculty offers a four-year Bachelor of Physical Activity Studies degree as well as a two-year Certificate in Physical Activity Studies (Adapted Physical Activity). Areas of study include: Adapted Physical Activity Studies, which prepares students for work with special populations such as individuals with mental and physical challenges; Fitness and Lifestyle, which provides students with knowledge in physical fitness, wellness and lifestyle modification; Recreation Administration, which focuses on the development of an understanding of the recreation delivery system; and Sport Administration, which teaches students to focus on the application of management principles, the organization and evaluation of sport programs and the analysis and knowledge of facilities.

The Faculty enrolls approximately 210 full-time⁵³ and 20 part-time undergraduate and 1 full-time and 20 part-time graduate students. The mean high school senior matriculation average for entrance into the faculty is approximately 74%. The faculty's high school cut-off average in 1995-96 was 65%.

The Physical Activity Studies' annual budget is \$1.6 million.

⁵² Of which approximately 54% are male and 46% are female.

⁵³ Of which approximately 55% are male and 45% are female.

7. The Faculty of Science

Four-year Bachelor of Science (and Honours) degrees are offered in Biology, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics and Statistics, and Physics. In addition, the Faculty offers Co-op programs in Computer Science, Mathematics and Chemistry. Certificate programs are also offered in Computer Science and Indian Health Studies (in conjunction with SIFC). Approximately 500 full-time⁵⁴ and 125 part-time undergraduate students are enrolled each year in the Faculty of Science. In addition, 663 students are annually enrolled in the Faculty through Campion College, SIFC and Luther College.⁵⁵ The Faculty of Science also has a heavy emphasis on graduate work, teaching approximately 70 full-time and 95 part-time graduate students. The Computer Science department of the Faculty of Science is presently being reviewed for accreditation.

Average senior matriculation entrance averages to the Faculty of Science have been about 79%. 65% was the cut-off average in 1995-96 for students applying for admission into the Faculty.

The Faculty of Science operates on an annual budget of about \$8.9 million.

8. The Faculty of Social Work

The School of Social Work Mission Statement sums up the educational goals of the faculty as follows:

The social work program of education, research and community service is designed to prepare students for generalist social work practice with diverse peoples. Informed by the principles of social justice, the social work program encourages students to identify the needs of the disadvantaged, marginalized and oppressed; to develop the commitment, knowledge, values, attitudes and skills required to confront structure inequalities; to address personal issues; and to empower individuals, families, and communities to realize their full potential.

Delivering course instruction regularly in Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, the School of Social Work offers Bachelor degrees of Social Work, Indian Social Work and Human Justice. Moreover, certificates are offered in each of those three disciplines. The school's programs are generalist in their focus and oriented particularly to the Saskatchewan situation with an emphasis on preparation for work in rural and remote areas with minority and disadvantaged groups. The Faculty is currently being reviewed for accreditation. accreditation will be granted.

⁵⁴ Of which approximately 66% are male and 33% are female.

⁵⁵ The totals for Campion, SIFC and Luther are, respectively, 355, 31 and 277.

Contained within the Faculty of Social Work, the School of Human Justice offers courses primarily to part-time students and is designed to meet the needs for professional education in justice services and to stimulate, conduct and provide leadership for research in this field.

The School of Social Work is made up of 303 full-time⁵⁶ and 321 part-time undergraduate and 10 full-time and 33 part-time graduate students. Moreover, approximately 145 full-time and 11 part-time undergraduate students are enrolled in Social Work through SIFC.

Although Social Work is a direct-entry program, the Faculty requires all of its students to have completed 1800 hours of human service as a pre-requisite to admission. Consequently, few of the Faculty's students enter into the program directly from high school.

This faculty operates on an annual budget of approximately \$2.1 million.

9. The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

Graduate students at the U. of R. are enrolled in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, although they are reported here with the faculty which houses their area of specialization. The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Regina offers PhD Degrees in Biology, Chemistry, Biochemistry, Computer Science, Engineering, Mathematics, Physics and Psychology. Masters degrees are offered in a variety of areas of specializations in Applied Science, Business Administration, Arts, Fine Arts, Music, Education, Physical Activity Studies, Public Administration, Vocational/Technical Education, Science and Social Work. The research activities of the University are discussed below in Section VII., Research.

VII. RESEARCH

Saskatchewan's universities provide considerable support to research and development activity in the province. The universities are Saskatchewan's leading source of research and development initiatives, accounting for almost 50% of the province's total annual research activity.

Research at both institutions, although actually conducted at the individual Faculty and College level, is administered under the auspices of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at the U. of R., and the College of Graduate Studies and Research at the U. of S. Considered by many within the university community as the touchstone of the academic institution, graduate studies and research involve about 11% of on-campus students registered at the University of Saskatchewan and about 9% of on-campus students at the University of Regina.

⁵⁶ Of which, approximately 30% are male and 70% are female.

The University of Saskatchewan

Research has always been a focal point of the University of Saskatchewan. Indeed, there are numerous facilities on campus which support graduate and research activities. Some of these include: the Royal University Hospital; Plant Biotechnology Institute of the National Research Council; Prairie and Northern Wildlife Research Centre of Canadian Wildlife Service; a Canada Agriculture Research Station; Canada Agriculture Health of Animals Laboratory; Protein, Oil and Starch Pilot Plant; National Hydrology Research Institute; Regional Medical Centre of the Canadian Penitentiary Service; Saskatchewan Research Council; Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration (Soil Mechanics and Materials Laboratory); and St. Pius X Seminary of Philosophy.

An important component of this research enterprise is the Innovation Place research park, which includes several of the above facilities as well as other major research and development organizations such as SED Systems and Biostar. Innovation Place now houses over 90 companies with an estimated annual impact on the province of more than \$150 million. Many of these are “spin-off” companies; to date, the U. of S. has created over 50 spin-off companies.

In addition, several research institutes form an integral part of the University, including the Institute of Space and Atmospheric Studies, and the Saskatchewan Centre for Soil Research, Crop Development Centre, Veterinary Infectious Diseases Centre, the Centre for Agricultural Medicine and many others. The Saskatchewan Accelerator Laboratory, with its 300 MeV electron accelerator and complementary facilities, offers unique opportunities for research in sub-atomic physics. Special facilities exist for hydrological studies, including a suitably instrumented drainage basin of about 415 sq. kilometres that is operated as one of the International Hydrologic Decade projects.

Possibly the most visible part of the research arm of the University of Saskatchewan are the research activities of the College of Agriculture which have developed innovative programs in food products and crop development. Its Crop Development Centre has created over 80 crop varieties since its was created in 1971, 14 of which were released in 1995. Specialty crops developed through the research activities of the College include Laird Lentil, Field Peas, Beans, Mustard and Sunflower. The economic spin-off from this research is substantial. For example, although research and development costs put into malting barley amounted to approximately \$3.5 million, the net benefit resulting from these input costs produced a value to producers of feed barley from 1984-95 which ranged from \$32 million to \$99 million annually.

In addition to funds the University employs out of its operating revenues which directly and indirectly help fund the research activities of the institution, the University receives additional research revenues from a variety of sources including the Medical Research Council (“MRC”), the Natural Sciences and Research Council (“NSERC”), the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (“SSHRC”), the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and other miscellaneous outside sources. In 1994-95 these revenues totalled \$49,112,000.

The University of Regina

Although somewhat more modest in terms of research capacity and accomplishments than the U. of S., the University of Regina faculty is also active in the pursuit of their scholarly work and

research. Faculty research spans the breadth of the University's programs and includes research at its various stages, from basic research and reflective inquiry to applied research and development work. In addition to graduate education within academic units, students can be associated with specialized research units within the University. These research units are usually interdisciplinary in nature, so the students can have contact with faculty and technical staff from various disciplines.

In addition to the research conducted by individual faculty members, a number of research groups are associated with the University. These include the Canadian Institute for Broadband and Information Network Technologies Incorporated ("CIBINT"), the Canadian Plains Research Centre ("CPRC"), the Centre for Advanced Systems ("CAS"), the Centre for Geographic Information Systems ("GIS"), the Development Institute of Saskatchewan ("TDI"), the Energy Research Unit ("ERU"), Genbiotek, the Institute for Health Studies ("IHS"), the Institute for Northeast Asian Studies ("INAS"), the Language Institute (L'institute de formation linguistique), the Regina Experimental Group for Intermediate Energy Physics Research ("REGIE"), the Regina Water Research Institute, the Sample Survey and Data Bank Unit ("SSDBU"), the Saskatchewan Instructional Development and Research Unit and the Social Administration Research Unit ("SARU"). The University has recently entered into an agreement with the City of Regina, the Regina Economic Development Authority and Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation which will provide for the establishment of a research park to be located on the University Campus.

In addition to the funds the University of Regina employs from its revenues to fund the graduate and research activities of its students and faculty, a significant amount of external support is also generated each year to support these activities. In fact, between NSERC, SSHRC, the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, the Canadian International Development Agency ("CIDA") and other outside sources, external support for research contributed over \$6.2 million to the University for the 1995-96 year, a significant increase from the \$3.3 million it received in 1990-91.

VIII. EXTENSION AND DISTANCE EDUCATION

The University of Saskatchewan

The University of Saskatchewan 1996-97 General Academic calendar describes its Extension Division, in part, as follows:

The Extension Division of the University of Saskatchewan fosters lifelong learning by providing university-based education and information to meet personal, professional, and community educational needs. ...

Extension programmers at the University of Saskatchewan work with individuals, the regional colleges and groups within a number of communities around the province to develop opportunities through a range of educational offerings: face-to-face and distance education courses, seminars, workshops, conferences, in-service training sessions, and formal and informal consultation. In addition, the Extension Division produces home-study learning packages that include printed as well as audio-visual materials.

The Extension Division of the U. of S. is divided into two broad divisions. The Professional Development and Community Education Division offers opportunities for professionals to improve their qualifications and stay current in their fields of expertise as well as a number of programs for various non-university groups. The offerings of this division include: an Adult Education program, the Agriculture Division, the Business and Management Division, a Career Development program, the Centre for Second Language Instruction, the Community Arts Division, the Community Development Education Division, an Environment, Science and Technology program, the Horticulture program, an Humanities and Social Sciences program, an Indigenous Peoples program, the Instructional Development Division, the Seniors' Education Division, a Women's Studies program and a variety of courses related to personal development and the acquisition of interpersonal coping skills. The second broad division of the Extension Division is the Extension Credit Studies Office which offers a "program" approach which enables off-campus students to attain the equivalent of second-year standing in a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree in the College of Arts and Science. The Extension Credit Studies Office also offers several certificates in cooperation with colleges on campus. These include certificates in Business Administration, Agriculture, Methods of Teaching Heritage Languages, Adult and Continuing Education, Teaching English as a Second Language and Prairie Horticulture.

Televised distance delivery at the U. of S. is coordinated out of the University's media unit, the Division of Audio and Visual Services ("DAVS"). Between 1981 and 1986, DAVS initiated experiments to assess the delivery of televised courses via satellite. Given experimental satellite time and a satellite uplink by the Federal Department of Communications, DAVS began to build institutional partnerships in distance education. These included the University of Regina, Saskatchewan Regional Colleges, Credit Union Central, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, SaskHealth and the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology. In 1989, the Saskatchewan Government licensed the Saskatchewan Communications Network ("SCN") as a provincial educational broadcaster in Canada. SCN was launched by multi-plexing two television channels on one satellite transponder. One channel, the public television channel is broadcast via satellite to cable subscribers. The second channel, the "Training Network" enables learners to acquire skills, professional upgrading and the foundation of a university degree in their home communities. Today this closed circuit network is received at over 100 regional college sites and high schools in the province. The University receives funding from SCN to develop programs for the Training Network which assist the University to offer full courses in English, Sociology, Native Studies, Political Studies and History. Classes are received weekly by close to 1000 students in over 100 rural communities. In addition, the network is used for the delivery of certificate programs in Agriculture as well as legal education and professional development for farmers.

The University of Regina

With a mandate similar to that of the University of Saskatchewan's Extension Division, University of Regina Extension is dedicated to linking the University's resources to individual and group learning needs in the community. Through a variety of delivery mechanisms University Extension offers a wide selection of programs in four general categories:

- (1) Certificate/degree courses, which may carry credit toward a University certificate, degree or professional designation.

- (2) Off-campus Degree-credit courses, which carry credit toward University degree.
- (3) Conservatory of Music and Dance: Group classes and private instruction in music and dance for children and adults of all ages.
- (4) Seniors' Education Centre: Learning opportunities on an off-campus, and applied research projects in Saskatchewan and beyond.

University Extension co-operates with regional colleges, SIAST, the Faculty of Social Work and the School of Human Justice and the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College to offer off-campus courses for part-time and full-time students in many Saskatchewan communities. In addition to the degree credit courses, certificates are available in Administration, Community Development, Data Processing, Gerontology, Local Government Administration, Physical Activity Studies (Adapted), Public Relations, Continuing Education Administrative Development), Continuing Education Alcohol and Chemical Dependency Studies, Continuing Education Indian Career and Community Counselling, First Nations Language Instruction, Heritage Language Teaching and a variety of others.

Much like the University of Saskatchewan's Extension Division, University Extension co-operates with SCN to offer televised courses to individuals across the province.

IX. GOVERNANCE

The University of Saskatchewan

The University constitution is determined by *The University of Saskatchewan Act* which was first passed in 1907.⁵⁷ Academic and administrative affairs at the University of Saskatchewan are governed by a number of bodies which, collectively, embody traditional collegial processes. The current composition and functions of the various bodies making up the University are as follows:

Convocation is composed of the Chancellor, the Senate and all graduates of the University. Its function is to confer degrees, certificates and honorary degrees and to admit graduands to the convocations.

The *Senate* is composed of the present and former Chancellors, the President, the Vice-Presidents of the University, the Minister, the Deputy Minister, the Chairperson of the Educational Council, principals of federated or affiliated colleges, Deans or Acting Deans of colleges, and such other Deans of Academic and Student Affairs and such Directors as nominated by the Senate, 14 electoral district members, 14 members-at-large, 6 undergraduate students, one graduate student and representatives of professional societies, groups or organizations in the Province which in the opinion of the Senate contribute in a significant way to the social, economic and cultural welfare of the Province and have demonstrated interest in furthering the goals of higher education and research at the University.

⁵⁷ The Act underwent a major revision in 1974 when the University of Regina became an autonomous institution. In 1995, a new Act, *The University of Saskatchewan Act, 1995* was passed by the legislature.

The Senate's basic function is to participate in the governance of the academic affairs of the University. In addition to some matters related to student discipline, the Senate may make recommendations to the Board and Council respecting the establishment or disestablishment of any college, school, department or institute.

The *Board of Governors* consists of twelve members, including the Chancellor, the President of the University, the President of the U.S.S.U., six members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, two members elected by the Senate, and one faculty member elected by the faculty. The Board is responsible for overseeing and directing all matters respecting the management, administration and control of the university's property, revenue and financial affairs. In addition to general managerial powers such as the purchase and maintenance of physical facilities or the establishment of pension plans or benefit programs, the Board has the statutory power, if it considers it necessary because of financial exigency, to provide for the disestablishment of any college, school, department, chair, endowed chair or institute.

The *Council* consists of the President, Vice President (Academic), two faculty members, (one of which will be the Dean if no election is required) representing each college and affiliated and federated colleges, the library and the extension division, one student representing each college and each affiliated and federated college, and 54 faculty members-at-large, for a total of 116 members. The Council is responsible for overseeing and directing the University's academic affairs. In addition to its powers respecting the granting of degrees and scholarships, Council may, where it considers it appropriate on academic grounds, authorize the Board to provide for the establishment or disestablishment of any college, school, department, chair, endowed chair or institute. In general, it oversees virtually all aspects of the academic affairs of the University including, admissions, curricula, methods of evaluation, discipline, and the conduct of examinations.

The *General Academic Assembly*, which consists of the President, the Vice-Presidents, Secretary, Registrar, all Deans and Directors employed by the University or affiliated or federated colleges, all faculty members and a number of full-time students who are elected by the full-time students, meets annually to hear the report of the President respecting the state of the University. In addition, the General Academic Assembly may require the Council to reconsider its decision to authorize the Board to provide for, on academic grounds, the establishment or disestablishment of any college, department, chair, endowed chair or institute. The Assembly also has the power to vote to dissolve the Council.

The *faculties* of the different colleges have, subject to the general control of the Council, control over all matters of scholarship within their respective colleges. Each College is headed by a Dean and formal membership includes the Dean and the teaching members of the various associated disciplines.

Advisory Councils have been set up for some colleges (e.g. Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine) to consider and report to the Senate and Board of Governors on general regulations, courses of study and other related matters within the colleges for which they are appointed, as set forth in the Senate Statutes.

The University of Regina

The University of Regina was established by and operates under *The University of Regina Act*. Its governance mechanisms involve the following bodies:

Convocation is composed of the Chancellor, the Senate, all graduates of the University of Saskatchewan at Regina, all graduates of the University of Regina and such other classes of persons as the Senate may from time to time determine. Graduates of the University of Saskatchewan, as defined by *The University Act, 1968*, may become members of Convocation of the University of Regina by notifying the Secretary in writing of their desire to do so. Convocation's general function is to consider all questions affecting the interests and well-being of the University and to make representations to the Senate or Board. Apart from extraordinary meetings which may be called, Convocation normally meets twice annually, in May and October, for the admission of candidates to degrees.

Because of its broad public representation, *Senate* has been described as the University's "window on the world". Its general area of concern is the academic welfare of the institution and, within this area, it has a variety of duties and powers. It is the senior body on academic matters and most of the broader issues of academic policy within the University. In another role, it acts as an ultimate court in academic affairs. The membership of Senate includes approximately 30 persons by virtue of their offices. Another fourteen members of Convocation are elected to the Senate by Convocation. Six students of the University are elected to Senate by students registered in the University. In addition, any professional society, group or organization in the Province that, in the opinion of the Senate, contributes in a significant way to the social, economic and cultural welfare of the Province may be represented on Senate.

The *Board of Governors* consists of twelve members, including the Chancellor, the President of the University, six members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, two members elected by the Senate, one student and one faculty member, and is responsible for overseeing the administrative and business affairs of the University. Within the structure of the University, it has the ultimate authority in all matters related to the raising and spending of University funds, and the acquisition and management of University property.

Council is the senior internal body responsible for academic matters. Its membership is comprised of a number of administrative officers, all Deans and directors of academic programs, all members of teaching staff, except sessional lecturers, and six student representatives. Many of Council's powers have been delegated to an elected Executive of Council, which is comprised of elected representatives from each faculty, the dean, the vice-presidents and the president, and which meets on a regular, monthly basis.

Disciplines that are related to one another in the broader areas of teaching are, for purposes of administrative and academic planning, brought together into Faculties of which there are eight. Each Faculty is headed by a Dean and formal membership includes the Dean and the teaching members of the various associated disciplines. The Deans are recognized by the University Act as being the chief executive officers of the Faculties and are directly responsible to the President. Each Faculty, subject to the statutes of the Senate and the general control of the University Council, has charge of all internal matters of scholarship.