



Wednesday, October 13, 2021

4:00 p.m. via Zoom

Present: M. Mahon, (Chair), K. Alexander, B. Badiuk, L. Barrett, J. Blum, G. Bonifacio, R. Bright, N. Buis Deering, C. Carnaghan, B. Cummins, C. Currie, C. Devoy, J. Dobbie, P. Dutt, A. Dymond, K. Godfrey, K. Greenwood, T. Harrison, M. Hawkins, M. Helstein, H. Jansen, D. Jarvie, L. Kennedy, M. Kildaw, H. Kletke, O. Kovalchuk, M. Letts, Y. Li, R. Lindblad, M. Magnuson, S. Malla, R. Marynowski, K. Massey, J. Mather, C. Mattatall, I. McAdam, D. McIntyre, D. McMartin, A. Mendenhall, D. O'Donnell, G. Ogilvie, E. Okine, T. Oosterbroek, B. Parker, R. Parkkari, T. Patel, N. Rebry, J. Rice, D. Scott, M. Serebryansky, P. Shao, J. Sheriff, L. Spencer, C. Steinke, D. St. Georges, A. Taylor, S. Urquhart, K. Walker, N. Walker, P. Wilson, S. Wismath, R. Wood, R. Yalamova

Regrets: A. Dodd, C. Fleischman, I. Genee, P. Ghazalian, D. Olsen, M. Stingl, A. Zovoilis

Other: J. Gallais, K. Fuglerud, V. Grisack, T. Henschel, M. Mathurin-Moe, H. Mirau, S. Nieboer, R. Westlund, M. Whipple

Oki. The President opened the meeting with a welcome and the Territorial Statement.

M. Mahon recognized the stress of Covid and that it is not an easy time for all. The purpose of this process is that we still have a serious budget challenge, and the Board expects a budget that will address the shortfalls. We are still in listening mode but are moving towards making decisions. It was noted that to be successful, we need to hear all the voices around the table.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: gfc.2021.10.05

Massey/Letts

That the Agenda for GFC Meeting #558.1 held Wednesday, October 13, 2021 be approved.

Motion: Carried

2. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION/ACTION

- 2.1. GFC Involvement with Ongoing Faculty Structure Process of Information Gathering
M. Mahon introduced E. Okine who began by giving some context and background. They want to hear directly from those within disciplines and will be doing so through

Faculty Councils as a starting point. They are conscious of the Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA) constructs & GFC. Once ready, the proposal will come to GFC first for information and feedback and subsequently for recommendation as per PSLA 19(e) and 26(1)(l) which gives GFC the recommendation powers that they have. The Provost's Office will visit Faculty Councils to engage the broad base of faculty members and student representatives present in those spaces. There will be two objectives to the process: information sharing and to seek feedback on process for information/idea gathering. In regards to the sharing of information, the Provost's Office will share information on a broadly proposed 5 Faculty model, with the potential for a 6th one that brings together core institutional wide activities. In ensuring transparency, there needs to be a reduction from the current 8 academic faculties/schools/units and a reduction in the number of departments/units within each faculty. The specifics of a proposal to GFC are still to be determined.

The information shared at Faculty Councils will include the proposed broad areas for 5 faculties, with the potential for a 6th faculty. (Arts, Business, Education, Health, Science, + potential for 6th (or not) to bring together core institution-wide activities). We will share expected financial savings and revenue generation opportunities associated with the broad recommendation and the other intended benefits as well as the pros and cons of broad recommendation. The present emphasis is on academic administrative structures (Faculties, Schools, Departments/Units) and not on Programs of Study (Degrees, Majors, Minors, etc.).

With regards to information and idea gathering, a question will be asked of the Faculty Councils: How should we best seek the information from you and your department/unit? As well they will be asked about connections between departments and units as well as programming, research, etc.

After gathering the information, the information will flow back to GFC through the many members of GFC (faculty, student representatives, Deans) who also belong to their respective Faculty Councils. Once ready, the proposal will come to GFC first for information and feedback for consideration as per the governance process dictated by the PSLA & GFC bylaws. Subsequently the proposal will then come to GFC for recommendation as per 19(e) and 26(1)(l) in the PSLA.

M. Mahon stated that GFC Executive had a discussion and we want to have the most voices heard today.

MOTION: gfc.2021.10.06
(Includes all friendly amendments made throughout the meeting.)

Letts/Marynowski

That all GFC Members be invited to attend each school/faculty-wide meeting inclusive of faculty, staff and student representatives. As part of the presentations, each group will hear about plans, schedules and cost/benefit outcomes. At each GFC meeting, prior to an official

recommendation being requested of GFC, a standing agenda item on Faculty Structures will be added for information. The proposal on Faculty structures will be presented for discussion, feedback and potential revisions at a GFC Meeting. At a subsequent GFC meeting the proposal will come to GFC for recommendation as per PSLA.

Motion: Carried (1 abstention)

There was a discussion amongst many of the members and senior executive on aspects of the PSLA and how this should guide the process. A member asked about the three principals within the agenda, and it was clarified that the principals were discussed by GFC Executive, not approved, and it was agreed they were to be included in the agenda. Clarity was provided on the program of studies is defined by the PSLA, and this is not talking about degree structure but the recommendations will talk about faculty structures that support them. The first piece is to be brought to General Faculties Council for discussion and debate and then back to GFC to make a recommendation. It will be brought back first to provide feedback before we ask for a recommendation.

It was noted by some of the deans that they would like to see the wide representation of GFC come to the faculty council discussions to broaden the consultation and to make sure that all voices are heard. It was noted that in some faculties, the faculty council is not representative of the whole faculty such as in the Dhillon School of Business or in Education.

It was suggested and agreed that there be a friendly amendment to make it inclusive to include all the named structures in a faculty that bring everyone together.

Additional rationale was requested and provided around the motion. It was added that who and how would you pick representation as the process needs to be thorough so all should be invited, the cost/benefit is as requested before and is important as well as procedural role on how information should flow ensuring it comes once before being presented for final recommendation to the Board.

Concerns over degree granting vs structure were discussed, noting that no changes are being made to the program degree structure, only the faculty administrative structure.

Another friendly amendment was agreed to that includes discuss and provide feedback with a potential revision of the proposal before it goes to the Board of Governors.

Some member liked the inclusivity of all of GFC and that those who are not part of a faculty or a student can also participate in the discussion. Additionally noting the transparent exchange of information while being respectful of the government's process.

A Dean (as Chair of a Faculty/School Council), indicated they appreciate the process guidance and would welcome all of GFC to come to their faculty council to participate in the discussion.

There were comments on wanting an unbundling of the motion with some concerns being raised of losing important aspects if each part is treated separately.

It was clarified that the proposal will have the expected financial benefits and cost savings; however, the disclosure of salaries is a concern as private considerations could be in the details in the cost analysis. There was discussion that the details of the cost benefits are tied to the model that we vote on. It was reiterated that we also need to be mindful and hear from the non-academic staff in the various areas as well. Five vs potentially six faculties

could make a large difference in the cost benefits, so the intent of the feedback is that here are the ways we could save money. The intent is that feedback will guide the decisions. Discussion occurred on the last sentence was asked for - in terms of who will make the proposal and how is feedback included into the final proposal to the Board? The Chair responded that the normal process on large decisions is to bring it for information so that GFC would have the discussion and give feedback prior to a final recommendation that would come back to GFC. GFC can make motions and recommend to the Board but the final decision comes from the Board of Governors. The Provost would bring the recommendation forward. An inquiry arose on additional clarity in the motion that GFC has direct input to the proposal and in the end there was comfort proceeding with the wording as is.

MOTION: gfc.2021.10.07

Marynowski/Rice

To call for the question.

Motion: Defeated (required 2/3 approval)

The Chair asked members to stand at ease. Upon return it was clarified that the motion requires a seconder, is not debatable and a 2/3 approval is required. Clarity was provided that if this motion carries it means that further discussion would end and the main motion on the floor would be immediately voted on. A poll vote was held.

Further discussion arose on the proposal on faculty structures to be developed by GFC with a proposal brought by the Provost. The Chair spoke to the process already in the PSLA that has to be adhered to of the Board having final approval. A friendly amendment was suggested by a member to add that additionally the proposal on faculty structures will be developed by GFC. It was deemed not a friendly amendment in that the Provost and Vice-President (Finance & Administration) are responsible to the Board on finance and the role of administration. There is a difference in GFC receiving recommendations, to debate/revise or chose to not recommend, but it is not the role of GFC to develop the proposal. Further discussion occurred on clarity of process, and it was stated that as normal process the intent would be for the proposal to come to GFC for debate/revision/information and then come back at a future GFC meeting for further discussion and final recommendations. It was added that ultimately action on the proposal is taken by the Board and the Board could receive the recommendation(s) and act on it or change it. A friendly amendment was accepted for clarity to add "recommendations as per the PSLA" to the last part of the motion.

There was discussion on wording of the proposal recommendations versus actions and how this is used in the PSLA. GFC makes recommendations that ultimately go to the Board. There is only one final decision that is made accordingly to the PSLA and that is by the Board and then the Board receives the recommendation(s) and may act on it or something else. An explanation on wording in a motion was asked and it was explained that using the same wording within the PSLA such as recommendation ensures consistency.

Feedback from the faculty councils will be developed into the proposal by the Provost's Office and then will come to GFC. The President's role as Chair of GFC is to report on the discussion that happened at GFC to the Board. There are distinct roles, but the proposal will come to GFC, and there can be revisions that GFC will have its role in.

The Chair noted that nothing in this motion is to restrict the scope of GFC under the PSLA and its GFC Bylaws. There is no attempt to get GFC to vote on a way of narrowing itself from the rights in the Bylaws and the PSLA. The Chair stated that it is not his motion and to clarify that it was made by M. Letts and R. Marynowski. If the question is will, from the process perspective, the Chair, ensure that GFC has all of the rights as articulated under the PSLA in this process regarding a proposal? Absolutely, as that is his role as Chair. The Chair did not believe there is anything that could be seen in this motion that would suggest there is a narrowing of the role of GFC in any way. Part of the challenge of when we attempt to put language into a motion that interprets the PSLA, we start to be challenged in that there is language in the PSLA that we must follow. The role as Chair is to make sure that the PSLA is followed. That GFC has authority under the PSLA and that it is adhered to under any process we have.

The member responded if that response (above) is minuted then it satisfies their concerns.

The role of parliamentarian arose and it was clarified that advice is within the purview of the role as articulated in the GFC Bylaws.

A member asked for clarity in that GFC will make the recommendation to the Board and that the Chair/President's presentation to the Board will convey the discussions/recommendation(s) of GFC. It was stated the Chair has and will continue to do so.

All members were thanked for their participation in the good discussion.

3. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- 3.1. GFC Executive Committee Report – October 7, 2021
Received as information.

4. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: gfc.2021.10.08

Massey/Letts

That the GFC meeting #558.1 be adjourned.

Motion: Carried