



General Faculties Council
Academic Planning Committee
Approved Minutes

Wednesday, March 09, 2011
3-15 University Hall
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

ATTENDEES:

Carl Amrhein (Chair), Renée Elio (Delegate), Mary Persson (Delegate), Nick Dehod, Roy Coulthard, Ernie Ingles, Joanna Harrington, Christina Rinaldi, Loren Kline, Bob Luth, Heather Green, Chris Skappak, Gerry Kendal, Garry Bodnar (Coordinator), Deborah Holloway (Scribe)

PRESENTERS AND GUESTS:

Carl Amrhein, Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Chair, GFC Academic Planning Committee
Kathleen Brough, Portfolio Initiative Manager, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Lesley Cormack, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Zenon Kohut, Director, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS)
Dru Marshall, Deputy Provost
Kerry Mummery, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
George Pavlich, Associate Vice-President (Research)

OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Members agreed to the Agenda as circulated.

2. Approval of the Minutes of February 28, 2011

This item was withdrawn from the agenda. The Coordinator noted the Minutes from the GFC APC meeting of February 28, 2011 would be available for the Committee's next meeting.

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair provided comments of interest to members.

ACTION ITEMS

4. Transfer of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS) to the Faculty of Arts

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Lesley Cormack, Dean, Faculty of Arts; Zenon Kohut, Director, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS); George Pavlich, Associate Vice-President (Research)

Purpose of the Proposal: To seek approval from GFC APC to transfer CIUS to the Faculty of Arts from the Office of the Vice-President (Research).

Discussion:

Dr Pavlich introduced the item by noting that the proposal would complete a process begun in 2009 to bring the initiatives of CIUS closer to the related academic and research activities at the University. The advantages of the proposal include the following: professorial appointees are provided the opportunity to supervise graduate students; and opportunities to increase academic relationships will increase, as will opportunities to increase teaching and research initiatives.

Dean Cormack added that the Faculty of Arts has a strong contingent of scholars and networks engaging with and supporting ethnic communities, therefore, support within the Faculty for this proposal is strong.

Dr Kohut noted that the proposal would bring the CIUS closer to the teaching function of the institution. He added that the 'Statement of Operating Principles', included in the document before members, ensures that the mandate of CIUS would be delivered.

Motion: Kline/Ingles

That the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, the proposal to transfer the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS) to the Faculty of Arts from the Office of the Vice-President (Research), submitted jointly by the Faculty of Arts and the Office of the Vice-President (Research) and as set forth in Attachment 1, to be effective April 1, 2011.

CARRIED

5. Bachelor of Science (BSc)/Bachelor of Education (BEd) (Secondary) Combined Degrees Program (Augustana) – Degree Name Change

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter: Kathleen Brough, Portfolio Initiative Manager, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Purpose of the Proposal: GFC APC approved the BSc (Science Education)/BEd (Secondary) Combined Degrees Program between the Faculty of Education and Augustana Faculty in December, 2009.

This proposal to change the name of the program comes about as a result of subsequent consultation with the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC) during the quality review process for the proposed combined degree program. CAQC expressed concern about the name as proposed (BSc (Science Education)/BEd (Secondary) Combined Degrees Program). Specifically, members of CAQC were concerned that the descriptor "Science Education" did not accurately or helpfully describe the educational experience that the students would be receiving, especially given that students in the program will major in a number of specific science teaching areas such as Biology, Chemistry, Mathematical Sciences, *et cetera*. After consultation with the Deans of the Faculties concerned, all parties agreed that the name "Bachelor of Science (BSc)/Bachelor of Education (BEd) (Secondary) Combined Degrees Program (Augustana)" better aligned with other combined degree nomenclature at the University, such as the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE)/Bachelor of Education (BEd) (Secondary) Combined Degrees Program.

Discussion:

Ms Brough presented the item, noting that the Deans of the Faculties concerned had been consulted and were in agreement with the proposal.

Motion: Luth/Dehod

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve, under delegated authority from General Faculties Council, the proposal to change the name of the recently-approved Bachelor of Science (BSc) (Science Education)/Bachelor of Education (BEd) (Secondary) Degrees Programs to the "Bachelor of Science (BSc)/Bachelor of Education (BEd) (Secondary) Combined Degrees Program (Augustana)", as submitted jointly by Augustana Faculty, the Faculty of Education, and the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), to take effect upon final approval.

CARRIED

DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. Summary of the Academic Unit Review Report for the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenters: Dru Marshall, Deputy Provost; Kerry Mummery, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation

Purpose of the Proposal: The Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), following the procedures in Academic Unit Reviews Guidelines (January, 2007) reports to the GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC) and the Board Learning and Discovery Committee (BLDC) on completed unit reviews, for their information and discussion.

Discussion:

Deputy Provost Marshall began the discussion by outlining the purpose and processes employed regarding Unit Reviews. Unit Reviews are conducted to ensure high-quality programs and administrative procedures and policies at the University. Recommendations received from the Unit Review Team are considered and operationalized by units as possible, thus ensuring quality sustainability and enhancement. Regarding the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation Unit Review, she reported that the Administration was very pleased with quality of both the Review Team and the report it provided. She added that the report confirmed that the excellent reputation of the Faculty had been earned.

Dean Mummery noted that, as a new Dean, he found the timing of this Unit Review very helpful, adding that he was appreciative of the process, the caliber and work of the Review Team, and the resulting report.

During the ensuing discussion, the presenters addressed questions and comments expressed by members concerning the following matters: the lack of concentration in the report regarding Faculty research, as articulated in Dean Mummery's 'Concluding Remarks' in the document before members; the distinction between a Faculty being 'siloes' and the need for improvement in communication within the Faculty; why the Faculty views Athletics and Campus Recreation as distinct but equal partners, each requiring a Director; and how an expansion in graduate enrolment would be achieved, and whether both financial and supervisory capacity are available to accommodate that growth.

Members also engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the reallocation of undergraduate spaces related to graduate enrolment growth, how the devolution of the Enrolment Planning Envelope (EPE) funding that occurred in 2010 impacts enrolment planning and the setting of enrolment targets, the impact of Campus

Alberta principles on undergraduate enrolment at the University of Alberta, and the number of unfunded students currently in the system. The Chair suggested and Dr Marshall agreed that members would benefit from a detailed discussion on issues surrounding the reallocation of student spaces at the University of Alberta and the Provincial monies that are directly associated with these spaces. There was some suggestion this discussion could be in tandem with a broader discussion on enrolment management at this institution, particularly as work is being done to place into the UAPPOL environment the policies and procedures currently set out in Section 50 (*Enrolment Management*) of the GFC Policy Manual.

7. Academic Plan – Dare to Deliver 2011 – 2015: Update on Extension of the Plan

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

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

Purpose of the Proposal: For discussion/information.

Discussion:

The Chair reported that the question of whether or not to extend the term of the new Academic Plan, resulting in a Plan that would have an end date of June 30, 2017, had been raised. He noted that extending the end date would have the advantage of allowing the next President, who would begin office on July 1, 2015, time to develop her/his vision, followed by a period wherein the Academy would develop an Academic Plan designed to deliver on that vision. However, it had been noted that a great deal of consultation and planning have gone into the new Academic Plan, *Dare to Deliver 2011-2015*, and such a change may be viewed as interference in the normal cycle of consultations and approvals. The Chair sought the advice of GFC APC members regarding this issue.

During the ensuing discussion, members noted the following: the fluidity of the economic situation might render even the five-year time-frame too long, therefore, extending the end date may be neither meaningful or useful; a general reluctance to change the process at this stage in the approval route; a suggestion that the Comprehensive Institutional Plan (a new document prepared for Government this year) may come to be viewed as an annual update to the President's vision, the contrary view that the CIP would not be an appropriate vehicle for the internal audiences as is the Academic Plan, and the view that it would be premature to consider the role of the CIP going forward until the University receives feedback on the document from the Government of Alberta.

Members of GFC APC agreed to an alternative scenario that would retain the 2011-2015 timeframe for the Academic Plan and that, upon appointment, the new President could ask the Provost that the Academic Plan's end date be extended to allow time for him/her to develop the vision within the Academy. If the Provost received such a request from the President, he would bring it forward to GFC APC for consideration.

The Chair agreed that he and the Vice-President (Research) would brief General Faculties Council regarding this matter at its meeting of March 21, 2011.

8. Question Period

The Chair and the Coordinator reported that there were no action items for the March 23, 2011 meeting of GFC APC and asked for the advice of members. The Committee's consensus was that the meeting should be cancelled. The next regularly-scheduled meeting of GFC APC is set, therefore, for Wednesday, April 13,

2011.

INFORMATION ITEMS

9. Items Approved by the Committee by E-Mail Ballots

There were no items.

10. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings

There were no items.

CLOSING SESSION

11. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:05 pm.