



## GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL MEETING #576

### Approved Minutes

**Monday, October 2, 2023**

**3:00 p.m. in W646**

- Present:** D. Jayas, (Chair), A. Akbary, S. Alam, B. Allen, K. Anderson-Bain, L. Barrett, V. Baulkaran, N. Buis Deering, J. Burke, C. Burton, C. Carnaghan, J. Cunningham, J. Doan, J. Dobbie, A. Dymond, A. Ebenmelu, S. Findlay, P. Ghazalian (virtually), K. Godfrey (virtually), K. Greenwood, K. Haight, M. Helstein, M. Hill, C. Hosgood, B. Hughes, K. Ito, H. Jansen, S. Johnsrude, O. Kovalchuk (virtually), M. Letts, R. Marynowski, K. Massey, J. Mather, C. Mattatall, D. McMartin, A. Mukherjee, L. Ochieng, D. Olsen, R. Patel, R. Preston, N. Rebry, J. Rice, Y. Sackey-Forson, K. Schwarz, E. Scott, D. Slomp, L. Starr, R. Sutherland (virtually), N. Thakor (virtually), M. Thomas, S. Urquhart, L. Vogelsang, N. Walker, P. Wilson (virtually), J. Youngdahl, Y. Zheng, A. Zovoilis
- Regrets:** H. Davis-Fisch, S. Malla, D. McIntyre, D. McNeill, J. Oldfield, N. Patel, J. Reiter, J. Sadr, D. Smither, G. Tian, A. von Heyking, R. Williams, F. Wright
- Other:** J. Gallais, V. Grisack, L. Little Bear, M. Mathurin-Moe, S. Webber, R. Westlund, M. Whipple  
(other guests were present on Zoom)

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

---

### 1. CONSENT AGENDA APPROVAL

- 1.1. Approval of the October 2, 2023 Meeting #576 Agenda
- 1.2. Approval of the GFC Meeting #575 – September 11, 2023 Minutes

### INFORMATION

- 1.3. GFC Executive Committee Report – September 25, 2023
- 1.4. GFC Executive Committee Approved Minutes – #558 – September 1, 2023
- 1.5. GFC Standing Committee Reports

MOTION: gfc.2023.10.01

Massey/Marynowski

*That the General Faculties Council approve the October 2, 2023 Consent Agenda.*

Motion: Carried

---

## 2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

D. Jayas referred to the President's Report that was included in the agenda package. The President highlighted the community consultation for the Deputy Provost and VP Finance & Administration positions. He invited everyone to participate in the process.

## 3. QUESTION PERIOD

No questions were sent in advance. The Chair asked for any questions from the floor.

- K. Haight – a question was posed regarding the southern Alberta potential medical program and it was indicated that Agenda item 5.4 will cover that item.
- J. Mather - a question was posed regarding the question period and it was clarified that after the President's report we move into question period and any submitted questions will be addressed, followed by question from the floor. The member then asked when we will be loosening the lock down in the Science Commons? The students are locked out of areas of Science Commons and don't have access to some rooms. It is a continuing problem that is getting worse with the fulltime return of the students. N. Walker and M. Helstein will look into the issue as they are unaware of the concerns. M. Letts stated that the doors are key carded and he will ask for the rationale behind it. M. Thomas reported that in August the Students' Union had meetings with security. The advocacy for closing doors was for the safety of the faculty so she is now concerned about what the faculty actually wants. S. Findlay stated that the faculty wants to lock the doors after the students get there for safety. The Chair noted that N. Walker was taking notes so we will look into this issue and bring it back to GFC.

## 4. ITEMS FOR ACTION

### 4.1. GFC Academic Timetable Committee Definitions

MOTION: gfc.2023.10.02

Massey/Preston

*That General Faculties Council approve the definitions for hybrid and hyflex delivery methods.*

Motion: Carried

K. Massey introduced the definitions approved by the GFC Academic Timetable Committee. As faculty across campus are experimenting with different modes of delivery, the intent is to share common language across offerings, to better ensure common understanding. In particular, this will help students better understand the methods of delivery and the course expectations with respect to their in-person attendance in class as well as for assessments. This will help students in planning and course selection. Also assisting professors because they are able to make students accountable to the expectations, as the general expectations for delivery and assessment are defined in advance.

There was discussion around whether this might impact professor workload, if it created an expectation that both in-person and online delivery would be offered. It was noted that workload is administered through the collective agreement, and that process is unchanged. Rather, these definitions relate to what many academic staff are already doing in their classrooms by introducing common language and clarity, and that is valuable to both students and instructors. Further clarification was that this does not change the ability for a professor to be flexible with respect to a student illness or defined conference travel by a professor. The definitions are for use when a course specifically aims to deliver in these formats. These formats can also be combined with already existing definitions in the calendar regarding synchronous and asynchronous delivery. There was robust discussion on the types of blended learning that could be offered. It is to let the student know the accountability and the delivery method giving clarity to both the instructors and to the students.

Also acknowledged that part of enabling hyflex is the technology. It is important to identify a course through these definitions to also ensure that course is assigned to a classroom that can enable such deliver.

The intent of this was clarified to not move the institution fully in this way as we are an in-person learning institution, but to respond to some experimentation being engaged by professors for student engagement. This is being driven by the professors and not the students. We are trying to catch up to what the faculty are already doing so the students understand what they are signing up for and can plan accordingly and be accountable.

## **5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

### **5.1. Iniskim Indigenous Relations – Update**

D. Jayas introduced Dr. L. Little Bear, Vice-Provost (Iniskim Indigenous Relations) who gave background on the Iniskim Education process. The governance process is constantly evolving. Since the process was first written and passed by this body, the position of Vice Provost for Iniskim Indigenous Relations was instituted. This is part of the constant motion and our team went over the document and would like to streamline the operational process. Dr. Little Bear asked Shanda Webber to speak to the proposed changes to streamline Iniskim Governance process. We want to make sure that we streamline it with a Blackfoot lens. The Iniskim Governance Process restructuring design was displayed on the screen and is attached to the minutes. S. Webber discussed the various components of the chart. The circle is a lodge where we invite everyone in. We suggest that the individual circles are markers such as a teepee ring. They will action the way forward. The key to building relations is the communications area and how are we engaging in conversations in building trust in those relationships. There are partnerships with various units within the university to work together to provide a sense of belonging. We are looking at holistic student support. It was mentioned that the territorial acknowledgement is being said but how are you working this into your teaching. We need to put action behind the words. How are we staying true to the Niitsitapi values of the Blackfoot people and the TRC calls to action. The University's commitment is that we want to do the process right, that the engagement process will include the advisory circle but will build on those relationships.

We need to break down barriers. In Blackfoot, it takes a community to raise a child. We want to invite everyone in the collective circle into the lodge. There will be a more finalized process in the coming months.

#### 5.2. GFC Nominations Committee Nominations

J. Gallais reviewed the procedures for nominations for filling the vacancies on the GFC Nominations Committee. This will be brought forward to the November GFC meeting so talk to your colleagues to see if they are interested in serving. It is a great group of people to work with. Please reach out to the members of committee if you have questions.

#### 5.3. GFC Strategic Planning Committee Process Update

M. Helstein updated the members on the process that the GFC Strategic Planning Committee approved. It is included in the package. Individual engagements on the various plans will not be done (strategic research plan/people plan/strategic plan) but a large consultation will occur across the plans. The information will be brought back to GFC in the future, and it is a dynamic document so we can adjust as we go.

#### 5.4. Southern Alberta Potential Medical Programming Update

M. Helstein reported that the document included in the agenda is where this conversation is coming from. The Provost gave some background on how in early 2022, there was lots of conversation of the lack of doctors in rural spaces. There is evidence that if doctors are trained in rural spaces they are more likely to stay there. The UofL needed to be involved in the conversation to develop rural medicine programming. We need to work with the UofC, the UofA will work with Northwestern Polytechnic. Needs, viability and options were investigated along with looking at models in various parts of the country. The work is ongoing with a provincial steering committee working with Alberta Health. This group is looking at two centres, one in the north and one in the south with centres being different to meet the needs of the area and abilities of the institutions there. It was noted that support is needed from the medical community. There was discussion on what kind of community conversations need to happen as well as how the provincial government is supporting the process. The conversations are now moving to a more southern Alberta committee. The schedule for the conversations, terms of reference and the committee membership was discussed. Student membership will be discussed at the committee. This work cannot happen without government funding support.

#### 5.5. President's Report & Question Period Process

J. Gallais highlighted the new process of allowing questions in the advance. We ask that the questions be sent in advance to [governance@uleth.ca](mailto:governance@uleth.ca) or also available to be asked on the floor. The president commented that the questions are not limited to the president's report but if there is some research needed to get an answer, the question needs to be sent in advance.

### 6. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION:

gfc.2023.10.03

Preston/Marynowski

*That the GFC meeting of October 2, 2023 be adjourned.*

Motion: Carried