General Faculties Council
Academic Planning Committee
Approved Open Session Minutes

Wednesday, May 22, 2013
Room 2-31, South Academic Building
2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

ATTENDEES:

Voting Members:

Martin Ferguson-Pell  Acting Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Acting Chair, GFC
Lorne Babiuk  Vice-President (Research)
Phyllis Clark  Vice-President (Finance and Administration)
Dustin Chelen (Delegate)  President, Students' Union
Brent Epperson  President, Graduate Students' Association
Deanna Williamson  Academic Staff Member, Member of GFC
Joanna Harrington  Academic Staff Member, Member of GFC
Loren Kline  Academic Staff Member-at-large
Geeta Sehgal  NASA Member-at-large
Larry Prochner  Department Chair at-large
Alexander Schlacht  Undergraduate at-large

Non-Voting Members:

Gerry Kendal  Vice-Provost and University Registrar
Ed Blackburn  Member of the GFC Executive Committee
Bill Connor  Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Instruction)

Presenter(s):

Allen Berger  Dean, Augustana Faculty
Phyllis Clark  Vice-President (Finance and Administration)
Bill Connor  Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Instruction) and Chair, GFC
Martin Ferguson-Pell  Acting Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Acting Chair, GFC
Ian MacDonald  Chair, Department of Ophthalmology
Douglas Miller  Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
Debra Pozega Osburn  Vice-President (University Relations)
Lihong Yang  Assistant Registrar (International Admissions), Office of the Registrar

Staff:

Garry Bodnar  Coordinator, GFC Academic Planning Committee
Marion Haggarty-France  University Secretary
Andrea Patrick           Scribe

OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Kline/Sehgal

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve the Agenda.  

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of April 10, 2013

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Harrington/Kline

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve the Minutes of April 10, 2013.

CARRIED

3. Comments from the Acting Chair

The Acting Chair noted, that given the number of guests in attendance and the nature of today’s meeting agenda, he would deferred or dispense with his comments at this time.

ACTION ITEMS

4. Admission from Countries That Follow the British Education System – Proposed Changes to Section 17.2.1 of the University Calendar

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Bill Connor, Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Instruction) and Chair, GFC Academic Standards Committee; Lihong Yang, Assistant Registrar (International Admissions), Office of the Registrar

Purpose of the Proposal: To clarify requirements for admission from countries that follow the British Education System, as set out in the University Calendar.

Discussion:
Ms Yang explained that this proposal includes a complete and accurate description of admission requirements for applicants who have obtained their education within a British-patterned model of education; she added that this proposal had been presented to GFC APC at its February 27, 2013 meeting and was subsequently tabled pending further revisions suggested by members at the time.

Ms Yang stated that the proposal has been revised accordingly and includes an extended description of the minimum admission requirements when applying from a British-patterned educational system.

Professor Harrington expressed her unequivocal support for this revised version of the proposal.
Motion I: Harrington/Williamson

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee take from the table the matter of proposed changes to Section 17.2.1 (Admission from Countries that follow [sic] the British Education System) of the University Calendar, as submitted in the first instance by the Office of the Registrar and as considered by GFC APC at its February 27, 2013 meeting.

CARRIED

Motion II: Harrington/Chelen

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, proposed changes to Section 17.2.1 (Admission from Countries that follow [sic] the British Education System) of the University Calendar, as revised and re-submitted by the Office of the Registrar and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon approval and for publication in the 2014-2015 University Calendar.

CARRIED

5. Proposed Name Change for the Department of Ophthalmology to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Douglas Miller, Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry; Ian MacDonald, Chair, Department of Ophthalmology

Purpose of the Proposal: To change the name of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry’s Department of Ophthalmology to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences.

Discussion:
Dean Miller explained that the proposal had been approved by the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Faculty Council as well as the Department of Ophthalmology Department Council. He added that the name change is a signal to the community that the Department of Ophthalmology is a clinical department with a research-intensive focus.

Dr MacDonald explained that May is Vision Health Month and that it is the ideal moment to recognize the increased scope of activities currently occurring within the University’s Department of Ophthalmology by proposing the name change at this time. He stated that other Canadian universities have recently enacted similar changes to their own ophthalmology department names. He reported that the name change will increase quality recruitment opportunities by acknowledging the breadth and scope of visual sciences-related clinical and research endeavors within the Department. He noted that it will also raise the Department’s profile within the wider community of ophthalmology and visual sciences.

Members expressed a number of comments and questions, including, but not limited to: clarification about what is included within the field of visual sciences; and clarification with regard to the difference between the words “vision” and “visual.”

Motion: Kline/Sehgal

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, the proposed name change of the Department of Ophthalmology to the Department of
Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, as submitted by Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon final approval.

CARRIED

6. Merger of Augustana Faculty’s Department of Fine Arts and Department of Humanities

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Allen Berger, Dean, Augustana Faculty

Purpose of the Proposal: To merge Augustana Faculty’s current Department of Fine Arts and Department of Humanities into a single Department of Fine Arts and Humanities to create administrative efficiencies and reduced expenditures and help facilitate improved faculty communication and new collaborations in teaching and research.

Discussion:
Dean Berger briefed members on this proposal, explaining that it was originally proposed by faculty members within Augustana Faculty’s Department of Humanities and Department of Fine Arts approximately a year ago. He noted that, while at that time the idea was not moved forward, given the current climate of financial challenges at the University, it made more sense to combine these units now. He noted that the subsequent cost savings are relatively modest but, nevertheless, important for Augustana Faculty. He stated that planning around this merger has produced a unique model of specialized departmental leadership and that the merger will allow increased collaboration and administrative efficiencies. He emphasized that the proposal would not impact students or programs and highlighted that the Augustana Students’ Association has provided a letter of support for the merger. He drew members’ attention to the additional letters of support from other Deans included within the proposal material.

Members expressed a number of comments and questions in relation to this proposal, including, but not limited to: support for the proposal; thanks for consultation with students on this matter; and clarification on whether this merger will result in a physical relocation for any faculty members. On the last point, Dr Berger noted this impending merger would have no impact on the current location of faculty.

Motion: Williamson/Chelen

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee recommend to General Faculties Council the proposed merger of Augustana Faculty’s Department of Fine Arts and Department of Humanities into a single Department of Fine Arts and Humanities, as submitted by the Dean of Augustana Faculty and as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect July 1, 2013.

CARRIED


Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Martin Ferguson-Pell, Acting Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Debra Pozega Osburn, Vice-President (University Relations); Phyllis Clark, Vice-President (Finance and Administration)

Purpose of the Proposal: Under guidelines from Enterprise and Advanced Education (EAE), the University of Alberta has prepared the Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP) that incorporates the University’s
access plan, research plan, capital plan, and budgets into one comprehensive document. The CIP is for approval by the Board of Governors and is then filed with the appropriate Ministries of the Provincial Government. The CIP is written in support of the University’s vision and mission as outlined in Dare to Discover and its Academic Plan, Dare to Deliver. The CIP outlines the University’s academic and research priorities as articulated in the Academic Chapter, which in turn drives the University’s capital and resource allocation priorities.

The CIP 2013 was formally withdrawn from the Board of Governors’ agenda on March 15, 2013 following the early March, 2013 Provincial Budget announcement which included significant reductions to the University of Alberta’s Campus Alberta grant. To accommodate revisions to the CIP 2013 necessitated by the impact of these budget reductions, the University was granted subsequently by EAE an extension for submission of its Plan to May 31, 2013. Although the University’s financial circumstances have changed significantly, the institution is committed to its strategic goals and its quest for excellence in education and research. As such, the CIP 2013 remains mostly unchanged from the version that was recommended to the Board by GFC APC, the Board Learning and Discovery Committee (BLDC), and the Board Finance and Property Committee (BFPC) in February, 2013. Specifically, the revisions incorporated into the attached document that vary from the earlier version include:

- The Addendum to the CIP 2013 which includes a revised Institutional Budget Chapter and a revised Resource and Risk Implications Chapter
- Vignettes on:
  - Campus Alberta (pages 14 – 16)
  - Taking Initiative on Water Research (page 36)
  - International IMPACT (page 61)
  - Leadership in Digital Learning (page 112)
  - Building Sustainable Solutions (page 146)
- Changes in the number of enrollment targets in FLEs (page 87)
- Rescission of the previously-recommended Institutional Budget, 2013-14 Chapter (pages 147 - 163)
- Rescission of the previously-recommended Resource and Risk Implications Chapter (pages 164 – 172)

Discussion:
Dr Ferguson-Pell referred members to the correspondence laid out on the table before them, as provided by his Office and that of the Vice-President (Finance and Administration), which set out two Motions for GFC APC’s consideration. He briefed members on the difference between the two Motions as related to the proposed amended CIP, explaining that the first one includes a ‘friendly amendment’ to remove the ‘Budget Principles’ out of the CIP and recommend the CIP without those principles included therein to the Board of Governors for approval; the second Motion relates to recommending specifically on the ‘Budget Principles’ to General Faculties Council (GFC). Mr Bodnar clarified that the ‘Budget Principles’, following formal recommendation by GFC, will go forward to the Board of Governors for final approval at its June 21, 2013 meeting.

A member enquired whether the ‘friendly amendment’ to remove the ‘Budget Principles’ included just the six ‘Budget Principles’ set out on page xvii of the CIP Addendum. The Acting Chair confirmed this was the case.

Vice-President Pozega Osburn briefed members on the proposed revisions to the CIP, noting that most of the 2013 CIP previously recommended by GFC APC has not changed drastically. The document, she noted, continues to convey the message that, while the financial situation has changed at the University of Alberta, the institutional aspirations have not.
Vice-President Clark, aided by a PowerPoint presentation, updated members on the revised budget, noting that major revisions were required as a result of the unforeseen funding cuts introduced by the Provincial Government in early March, 2013. She spoke to the principles utilized to revise the institutional budget and the details of the structural deficit, noting that the loss of the 2% Campus Alberta grant funding commitment and the 7.2% further reduction in Campus Alberta grant funding have resulted in the current deficit of $67 million. During the presentation of the consolidated budget, Ms Clark emphasized that EAE requires it to be balanced, and she added that it is assumed that the Ministry will accept a deficit over the next three years to allow the institution to adjust to the funding situation. She stated that the budget, as presented, reflects the current reality and is not ideal, however, the Administration is attempting a measured adjustment approach going forward to allow time to plan strategically without making major decisions that might have permanent, negative consequences for the academy.

Vice-President Clark presented details surrounding the revenue and expenses within the proposed 2013-2014 budget as well as the timelines of the governance approval process for the amended CIP.

During the ensuing discussion, members expressed several comments and questions, including, but not limited to: that the revised CIP downplays the negative effects of the decrease in Provincial Government funding at the University of Alberta and that the public, in particular, may not be fully aware of the significant impact these cuts have for the institution; concern about the conflicting message within the CIP regarding the existence and use of endowment funds; clarification about why the salary information fluctuates throughout the data; clarification about the total amount of monies taken out of the academy since 2008; support of the document and those individuals who have worked to revise it in the face of the challenges incurred by the drastic change in funding; that the CIP reflects the services and support available to students at the University of Alberta; clarification about how enrolment targets in the Faculty of Education have been revised; concern that the word “non-permanent” has been removed before the word “CoSSS” within the “Consolidated Revenue” section of the CIP, that the Students’ Union (SU) was not made aware of this change, and that the member would not be able to support the Motion without an amendment to add the words “non-permanent” back into the CIP; further identification of possible short-and long-term solutions to the budget crisis and what the anticipated response would be from the Ministry on such measures; that an increase in graduate tuition is a concern for students but that the Graduate Students’ Association (GSA) is willing to work with other stakeholders to provide a unified position on the possible measure; that the administrative committees in which the CoSSS (ie, the Common Student Space, Sustainability and Services) fee, mandatory non-instructional fees, and tuition are discussed are viewed by the SU as valuable; clarification about efforts by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) to improve communications between Department Chairs, Deans, and graduate students regarding measures that impact graduate students, specifically regarding some of the changes to Teaching and Graduate Assistantships within the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Arts; that distribution of funds in relation to Graduate and Teaching Assistantships needs to be re-evaluated; and a suggestion to consider the generation of revenue by scheduling more summer courses in the manner of Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT).

Commenting that the word “non-permanent” had been included in other annual versions of the CIP to describe the CoSSS fee, Mr Chelen proposed a Motion to Amend to include the word “non-permanent” in front of the first iteration of the words “CoSSS fee” on page x of the CIP Addendum.

Motion to Amend Motion I: Chelen/Epperson

THAT the GFC Academic Planning amend the 2013 Comprehensive Institutional Plan to include the word "non-permanent" before the first iteration of the words “CoSSS fee” on page x of the CIP Addendum, as set
Motion I: Clark/Kline

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee recommend to the Board of Governors the ‘Addendum’ to the 2013 University of Alberta Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP), as provided by the President’s Executive Committee (PEC) and as set forth in Attachment 1, excluding the budget principles as found on page xvii of the materials before the members and with the exception of information pertinent to Ancillary Services’ budgets which is not within the purview of GFC APC to consider and/or recommend, and, concurrently, recommend to the Board the rescission of those sections within the CIP 2013 clearly identified with the ‘Rescind’ watermark (given their supersession by the content of the ‘Addendum’), all to take effect upon final approval.

CARRIED

Mr Chelen asked that his vote against Motion I be recorded.

With respect to the ‘Budget Principles’ presented to members, several members’ comments and questions were noted, including recommendations for revisions to the language, grammar, and punctuation within the document.

Professor Harrington proposed a “friendly amendment” to Motion II to make editorial amendments to the language, grammar, and punctuation of the ‘Budget Principles’. The Mover and Seconder of Motion II agreed with the proposed amendments, as did the proposers.

Motion II: Kline/Chelen

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee recommend to General Faculties Council the budget principles that will guide the University in developing the strategies that will enable the institution to achieve a sustainable budget, as provided by the President’s Executive Committee and as set forth in the attachment marked ‘Attachment 2’, as amended.

CARRIED

DISCUSSION ITEMS


Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Phyllis Clark, Vice-President (Finance and Administration); Mary Persson, Associate Vice-President (Audit and Analysis) and University Auditor

Purpose of the Proposal: For information and discussion and to comply with Enterprise and Advanced Education (EAE) legislation and guidelines. This document provides an institutional report to the Provincial Government on goals, objectives, and targets set out in the University of Alberta 2012 Comprehensive Institutional Plan. The Report is due for submission to the Minister of EAE by September 30, 2013.

Discussion:
Vice-President Clark explained to members that the Annual Report is a document prepared for the Government of Alberta on an annual basis which highlights accomplishments at the University during the
timeframe of April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013.

Ms Persson added that the Provincial Government has shortened their timeline and that the documentation, as presented to members, does not contain audited financial statements—this information will be included within the Report once it is completed. She noted that the Report is also still undergoing revisions to language and grammar.

A member enquired about the lack of comparator data within Figure 9 on page 18.

9. **Question Period**

Dr Ferguson-Pell noted that there has been recent discussion relating to whether the individual Faculty budget letters sent to the Deans should be made public. In response to this point, he explained the budget process in detail, adding that this year was unique due to the scope of the cuts to the institution. He reported that there are additional budget items within each tailored Faculty-specific letter this year, including measures that impact Teaching and Graduate Assistantships; subsequent to the distribution of these letters, there has been an outcry for the letters to be made public. He stated that the letters have not been released to preserve the integrity of the raw data contained within them, adding that Administration has been anxious about how the data might be oversimplified or incorrectly compared and analyzed. He stated that Deans have authority to express the contents of their budgets and letters to their individual Faculties using methods and timeframes that best suit members of each Faculty and that it is up to the discretion of each Dean to formulate an individualized communication strategy around their own budget. Dr Ferguson-Pell reported that the nature of this year’s differential cuts, as opposed to the usual across-the-board cuts, has also resulted in the sentiment within the community for complete disclosure. He stated that in a time of struggle for the institution, it would be best to avoid unnecessary practices that would result in additional confusion and strife among Faculties and members of the community. He invited members to comment on this issue.

Members, during the ensuing discussion, expressed several comments and questions in relation to this issue, including, but not limited to: that graduate students with the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Arts feel disillusioned by cuts to their programs and opportunities but that they appreciate information that has been offered so far and would appreciate more clarity on how the cuts might impact their future; that Deans should make the decisions whether to disclose the contents of their letters to members of their Faculties; that the reason each letter is different is due to the vast differences between Faculties and other academic units; and that this issue emphasizes the need for a more coordinated communication plan to address subjects before rumours and anxiety peak, as is the case regarding Teaching and Graduate Assistantships.

**INFORMATION REPORTS**

10. **Items Approved by the GFC Academic Planning Committee by E-Mail Ballots**

There were no items.

11. **Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings**

There were no items.

**CLOSING SESSION**
12. **Adjournment**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.