ATTENDEES:

Voting Members:
Olive Yonge Chair, Deputy Provost (Delegate of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic))
Elisabeth Le Vice-Chair, Academic Staff
Megha Bajaj Member (Delegate), Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students’ Association
Debbie Feisst Member, Academic Staff
Phil Haswell Member, Support Staff
Cory Hodgson Member (Delegate), Vice-President (Academic), Students’ Union
Pat Jansen Member (Delegate), Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
Erasmus Okine Member, Academic Staff
Joanne Profetto-McGrath Member, Academic Staff

Non-Voting Members:
Bernie Kessels Member (Delegate), Vice-Provost and University Registrar, Resource
Ben Louie Member, University Architect, Resource

Presenter(s):
Peter Alexander Associate Director, Campus Planning and Architecture, Planning and Project Delivery, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations
Tracy Bear Special Advisor to the Provost, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Shana Dion Director, Aboriginal Student Services Centre
Pat Jansen Executive Director, Planning and Project Delivery, Facilities and Operations (and Delegate, Vice-President (Facilities and Operations))
Ben Louie University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations
Douglas Olson Consultant, O2 Planning and Design
Craig Webber Principal, Group2 Architecture Interior Design Ltd
Olive Yonge Deputy Provost and Chair, GFC Facilities Development Committee

Staff:
Garry Bodnar, Coordinator and Scribe, GFC Facilities Development Committee

OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda
Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter: Olive Yonge, Deputy Provost and Chair, GFC Facilities Development Committee

Motion: Le/Haswell

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve the Agenda. 

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of May 22, 2014

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter: Olive Yonge, Deputy Provost and Chair, GFC Facilities Development Committee

Motion: Haswell/Le

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve the Minutes of May 22, 2014. 

CARRIED

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair extended a welcome to new member, Mr Cory Hodgson, and asked members to do a round of introductions.

ACTION ITEMS


Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Ben Louie, University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Tracy Bear, Special Advisor to the Provost, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Shana Dion, Director, Aboriginal Student Services Centre; Craig Webber, Principal, Group2 Architecture Interior Design Ltd

Purpose of the Proposal: To obtain approval for the Schematic Design Report for the Gathering Place and to provide further planning, funding application, and fundraising efforts towards the realization of constructing a Gathering Place on the University of Alberta’s North Campus in support of the institution’s Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP).

Discussion:
Ms Bear introduced the Gathering Place Schematic Design Report to members by means of a PowerPoint presentation. She noted that the Gathering Place was intended to serve a simple purpose, namely, to increase retention and graduation rates of Aboriginal students at the University of Alberta. The Gathering Place would be constructed in such a way as to both reflect and acknowledge the local indigenous cultures and histories; in doing so, it would serve both to decrease for Aboriginal students a sense of isolation and create a sense of belonging and community. The facility would serve as a place of hope, welcome, understanding, and connection. Finally, the Gathering Place, she noted, would stand as an important reminder of the University of Alberta’s commitment to the future generations of Canada’s indigenous youth.
by celebrating an important past and future value that indigenous people and culture contribute to the community and to society, as a whole.

Ms Bear continued by highlighting the following points: motivations for the construction of the Gathering Place, including reference to demographic statistics on Aboriginal populations and statistics on the educational attainment of Aboriginal peoples; the benefits of the Gathering place, including reference to the considerable, positive socio-economic impact of an educated Aboriginal workforce; and the means by which Gathering Place could prove to be a powerful initiative to engage Aboriginal learners in a way that could help serve the Province of Alberta in varied and wholly-constructive ways.

Ms Dion spoke to the role of Aboriginal Student Services Centre (ASSC) (which would be housed in the Gathering Place) and its provision of services that covered all aspects of student life. ASSC provided Aboriginal students with access to tutoring, counselling, and advising services; access to elders; a sense of community and belonging, to ensure students did not feel isolated and alone; smudging facilities; nutritional breaks on a drop-in basis; monthly social gatherings and cultural exchanges; a sense of ‘home’ with respected traditions; and, finally, a sense of connection with the institution. The Gathering Place, Ms Dion commented, would provide visitors to the University’s North Campus with a lasting, positive impression and students with a sense of empowerment, pride, and connection to Alberta’s Aboriginal communities.

Mr Louie, further assisted by the PowerPoint presentation, provided visual representations of the Gathering Place, with reference to the facility’s lower level, second floor, and an overall concept sketch of building. He noted that this facility, like others that had recently come before GFC FDC (eg, the Students’ Union Building (SUB) expansion, the Physical Activity and Wellness (PAW) Centre, the Alumni Association’s proposed President’s Circle, and the Saint Joseph’s College Women’s Residence), provided student-oriented spaces that served to enrich campus life and student success. He spoke to the facility’s connectivity to the rest of the North Campus, including via the Avenue Promenade.

Mr Webber, supported by the PowerPoint presentation, spoke to the following: the facility’s footprint, with reference to consolidation of functions/offices in the Gathering Place; the site plan; the landscape concept; the Level 1 (Main Floor) plan; the Level 2 (Upper Floor) plan; a summary of the Schematic Design Program; existing program synergies with Education North (eg, common areas, food services, lecture halls and classrooms, industrial arts laboratories, study and reading lounges, breakout rooms, the digital recording studio, cultural facilities, etc); visual representations of the entries to the Gathering Place, its east/west orientation, and its west, north, and east elevations; the transparency of the facility and the use of natural materials in its construction; furniture layouts; the Great Hall layouts; and art and exhibit layouts.

During the discussion surrounding this proposal, members expressed a number of comments and questions, including, but not limited to: the impact of the Gathering Place on the existing mural on the north face of Education North and how this artwork would be accommodated if and when the new facility is constructed; clarification of what a smudging room is; clarification on access to the LRT from within the facility; clarification on timelines associated with this project; the nature of the move of ASSC into this new facility; clarification on the usage of the Gathering Place’s change rooms; the nature of consultation with Aboriginal students on this project; whether there will be space between Education North and the south end of the Gathering Place; clarification on parking access and location; the anticipated impact of construction of the Gathering Place on ongoing activities in Education North; the potential for a considerable flow of students (and others) through the Gathering Place and its impact on activities within this facility; clarification as to where the building’s mechanical systems would be located; whether or not elevators would be built into the Gathering Place; and commentary on the positive nature of this project and how good it would be to see this advance quickly.
Motion: Le/Profetto-McGrath

THAT the GFC Facilities Development Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council and on the recommendation of Planning and Project Delivery, the proposed Gathering Place – Schematic Design Report (as set forth in Attachment 2) as the basis for further planning.

CARRIED

DISCUSSION ITEMS

5. North Campus Open Space Plan

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Ben Louie, University Architect, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Peter Alexander, Associate Director, Campus Planning and Architecture, Planning and Project Delivery, Office of the University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Douglas Olson, Consultant, O2 Planning and Design

*Purpose of the Proposal:* The goal of the North Campus Open Space Plan (NCOSP) is to identify potential opportunities within the campus landscape environment to support the University’s vision and mission. The NCOSP establishes a broad vision for the open space network on the campus grounds, helping to better articulate the character and personality of the campus, creating an engaging campus experience for students, staff, faculty, and neighbours, in addition to elevating the image and brand of the campus holistically. The NCOSP will ensure a unified and consistent campus character supporting the goals of student success and recruitment and continuous engagement with alumni and surrounding communities.

The NCOSP document provides the next level of detail for campus planning and is informed by the current Long Range Development Plans and community and other consultations since 2002. The Plan Implementation section outlines the opportunities for the University to consider in undertaking specific initiatives from the Plan. Landscape projects are considered a key factor in the integration of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and Sector Plans, infrastructure and operational considerations, and ongoing investment into the North Campus landscape.

*Discussion:* With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louie introduced this item to members. In his presentation, Mr Louie spoke to the following: the challenges and opportunities presented by and on the University’s North Campus, with reference to the particular challenges posed by the changing seasons; the principles of place making; design considerations (e.g., nodes and destinations, wayfinding, site furnishings, pathways, lighting, etc); the returns on investing in the shape and form of the North Campus; the Campus Strategic Concept and implementation of the Plan, along with its coordination with the University’s LRDP.

Mr Olson, assisted by the PowerPoint presentation, then continued by highlighting the following aspects of the North Campus Open Spaces Plan: an overview of the project and project goals; campus-wide issues, opportunities, and challenges, with reference to the eight Campus Precincts and the adjacent non-University institutional landowners; the future campus landscape, with reference (and visual representations) to the North Campus Strategic Concept, key projects (landmarks, gateways, edges, major districts, open spaces and nodes, and connections and pathways); visual representations of the (proposed) Gateway Plaza, River Valley Promenade, West Campus Promenade, 87 Avenue Corridor, Transit Hub/Prairie Parkland Plaza, Outdoor Amphitheatre, a reinvisioned Main Quad and Celebration Plaza expansion, the Open-Air Market, Fine Arts/Law Plaza, 89 Avenue Promenade, Café Promenade, and new linkages to the Main Quad.
During the discussion surrounding this initiative, members expressed a number of comments and questions, including, but not limited to: clarification with regard to the timelines associated with and prioritization of the varying elements of the Plan; a query regarding the types of traffic envisioned along the 89 Avenue corridor; clarification with respect to the choice of location for the Open-Air Market; clarification regarding the use of the term “smart growth” in the Plan; the nature of connections between HUB, the Fine Arts Building (FAB), the Central Academic Building (CAB), Quad, et cetera; a query whether or not the ground level of HUB would be opened up once again as a result of this planning; an expression of support for the comprehensiveness of the Plan; a question on how this kind of planning would be deployed for the University’s South Campus; and whether or not the Plan was flexible enough to accommodate further North Campus development (eg, the construction of additional new buildings).

6. Projects Update from Facilities and Operations

There were no documents.

Presenter: Pat Jansen, Executive Director, Planning and Project Delivery, Facilities and Operations (and Delegate, Vice-President (Facilities and Operations))

Purpose of the Proposal: For information/discussion.

Discussion:
Mr Jansen provided members with brief updates regarding current projects underway, including reference to the following:

- Physical Activity and Wellness (PAW) Centre – work continues to progress very well
- St Joseph’s College Women’s Residence – work continues to progress well
- Innovation Centre for Engineering (ICE) and Chemical/Materials Engineering (CME) Building – both projects are advancing
- Camrose Performing Arts Centre (CPAC) – this facility is very close to completion
- Expansion of the Students’ Union Building (SUB) – work continues on this project
- Medical Sciences Building – Pharmacy, Phase II, is underway, with the conversion of existing spaces on two floors to be completed by September, 2014
- Clinical Sciences Building (CSB) – alignment of the restacking of this facility continues
- Infill Housing Project in the East Campus Village (ECV) – work continues on this initiative
- Saskatchewan Drive Students’ Residence – work continues on this initiative

Mr Jansen noted the following projects (or elements thereof) were likely to come to GFC FDC in the near to medium future:

- Twin arenas (South Campus) business case development
- Michener Park redevelopment
- Sector Plan development for the Devonian Botanic Garden
- Augustana Campus – General Space Programme (Phase II)

7. Question Period

Members asked questions regarding: the closures of the exterior pedway separating the Central and South Academic Buildings (ie, CAB and SAB) and the interior link between these two facilities; and the
spatial relationship between the Saint Joseph’s College Women’s Residence and the proposed Aboriginal Gathering Place.

INFORMATION REPORTS

8. Items Approved by the GFC Facilities Development Committee by E-Mail Ballots

There were no items.

9. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings

- Newly-Scheduled Meeting of the GFC Facilities Development Committee (FDC) in June, 2014 - Determining Members’ Availability [E-Mailed to Members on May 26, 2014]

- Confirmation of the June 19, 2014 Meeting of the GFC Facilities Development Committee (FDC) [E-Mailed to Members on May 27, 2014]

CLOSING SESSION

10. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:25 pm.