



General Faculties Council  
Academic Planning Committee  
Approved Minutes

Monday, February 28, 2011  
3-15 University Hall  
4:00 pm – 5:00 pm

---

**ATTENDEES:**

Carl Amrhein (Chair), Lorne Babiuk, Phyllis Clark, Nick Dehod, Roy Coulthard, Deanna Williamson, Ernie Ingles, Joanna Harrington, Christina Rinaldi, Loren Kline, Bob Luth, Marc Arnal, Susan Barker, Gerry Kendal, Fay Fletcher, Garry Bodnar (Coordinator and Scribe)

**PRESENTERS AND GUESTS:**

Carl Amrhein, Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Chair, GFC Academic Planning Committee  
Lorne Babiuk, Vice-President (Research)  
Phyllis Clark, Vice-President (Finance and Administration)  
Don Hickey, Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

**OPENING SESSION**

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Members agreed to the Agenda, with some re-ordering of items.

2. Approval of the Minutes of February 23, 2011

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Williamson/Kline

Abstention: Luth

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve the Minutes of February 23, 2011.

**CARRIED**

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair raised with members the possibility of extending the length of the proposed (new) Academic Plan from what was to have been an endpoint date of 2015, concurrent with the start of a new Presidency at the University of Alberta, to a new endpoint of 2017. The rationale for suggesting this extension was that this would then allow a new President adequate time and opportunity to reflect on the strategic direction in which s/he would like to see the University move and, in turn, develop a new institutional academic plan without creating a void between 2015 (ie, the time the current Plan would come to an end) and the time the new plan is finally approved and in play. During the ensuing discussion, some members expressed support for the new Academic Plan's extension to 2017; others asked for more time upon which to reflect on this issue. The Provost asked members to continue to think on this issue and noted he would be

prepared to bring the question back to a future meeting of GFC APC for some form of resolution and, in turn, possible recommendation to GFC.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### 4. University of Alberta's Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP)

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenters:* Carl Amrhein, Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Chair, GFC Academic Planning Committee; Lorne Babiuk, Vice-President (Research); Phyllis Clark, Vice-President (Finance and Administration); Don Hickey, Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

*Purpose of the Proposal:* Under new guidelines from Advanced Education and Technology (AET), the University of Alberta has prepared one Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP) that incorporates elements of the University's access plan, research plan, capital plan, and budgets into one comprehensive document. The CIP replaces previous documents reviewed or approved by various governance committees including the Access Plan, University Plan, Capital Plan, and Budget. 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 Chapter 5, Academic Chapter, which in turn drives the University's capital and resource allocation priorities as found in Chapters 6, 7, and 8 of the CIP.

#### *Discussion:*

The Provost introduced this item to members. He spoke to the nature of the Motion before the Committee and provided some detail on how the CIP would work through institutional governance, leading to its approval by the Board of Governors. He noted careful consideration had been given to the progress of the CIP through this formal approval process to ensure and maintain the integrity of the University's governance structure which recognizes that GFC has primary responsibility for academic matters.

The presenters then turned to a PowerPoint presentation (that was also provided to members in hard copy at this point in the meeting) that highlighted the key issues and challenges faced by the University with respect to its Consolidated Budget for the upcoming budget cycle. Vice-President Clark spoke to the principal elements of the Consolidated Budget, as set out in the presentation; provided detail on the 2011-2012 Operating Budget; described the means by which the University currently depends upon the provision of Government monies for the institutional revenue stream; and set out potential future strategic 'asks' for Provincial funding to help offset costs associated with teaching/learning and infrastructure (eg, information technology) needs. Dr Amrhein interceded at this point by providing members with detail on the anticipated costs associated with creation of 'Knowledge Generating Units' (KGUs); he noted that, with all costs in for professors, infrastructure, and graduate student support, the amount per KGU was roughly \$600,000. Vice-President Hickey concluded the presentation by providing members with detail on capital revenue streams and expenditures and related costs to be incurred by the institution.

During the ensuing discussion, the presenters addressed questions and comments expressed by members concerning the following matters: the tension between the provision of both formal and informal 'learning spaces' versus the constant quest for more space to accommodate increased research activities; how undergraduate research space fits into the overall facilities planning framework, and the incorporation of undergraduate students into laboratory and other research space; the possible or likely presence of certain academic units on the University's South Campus and the 'West 240' lands; clarification on a statement

embedded in the document that described the likelihood of ongoing annual base budget cuts; and targets for inclusion of rural and Aboriginal students in the University's overall student population. Members also recommended a number of minor editorial amendments and corrected a series of typographical errors, all of which were accepted by the proposers as 'friendly amendments'.

Motion: Luth/Kline

Abstention: Dehod

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee recommend to the Board of Governors the 2011 University of Alberta Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP), as provided by the President's Executive Committee and as set forth in Attachment 1, as amended, with the exception of information pertinent to Ancillary Services' budgets which is not within the purview of GFC APC to consider and/or recommend, to take effect upon final approval.

**CARRIED**

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 5. Budget Update

*Presenter:* Carl Amrhein, Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Chair, GFC Academic Planning Committee

*Purpose of the Proposal:* For discussion/information.

*Discussion:*

The Provost described in some detail the current budgetary environment for the University of Alberta. In particular, Dr Amrhein focussed on the following issues: the Provincial Government's provision of lights-on funding for two major buildings (ie, the Edmonton Clinic Health Academy and the Centennial Centre for Interdisciplinary Science (CCIS)), both set to come on stream this year; commitments to Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research (AHFMR) transition funding for the next eight-year period; Government monies allotted specifically to allow the Province's post-secondary institutions to deal with a range of recruitment and retention issues, enrolment stabilization, and matters related to continuing to raise the profile of 'Campus Alberta'; infrastructure maintenance funding increases; and the continuance of Health Workforce Action Plan (HWAP) funding.

In response to a member's query regarding whether or not the Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP) would be amended now to reflect the fact the Provincial Government had provided the lights-on funding for CCIS and the Edmonton Clinic Health Academy, the Provost stated it was unlikely this adjustment could be made to the Plan at this stage but that there would certainly be some acknowledgement of this funding in correspondence accompanying the Plan at the time it was submitted formally to the Ministry of Advanced Education and Technology (AET).

### 6. Question Period

There were no additional questions.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### 7. Items Approved by the Committee by E-Mail Ballots

There were no items to date.

8. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings

There were no items to date.

**CLOSING SESSION**

9. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.