



## GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL MEETING #581

### Approved Minutes

**Monday, April 8, 2024**

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

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

*Oki. The Chair opened the meeting with a welcome and the Territorial Statement. The meeting began with a moment of silence for Dr. S. Thibodeau (former Health Sciences faculty), Dr. L. Heavy Shields Russell (Blackfoot Elder), T. Smith (student), Professor S. Stanley (former Fine Arts faculty).*

*The SU Students were thanked for their service to GFC as for some this is their last meeting. The GSA students were also thanked and welcomed back.*

---

### 1. CONSENT AGENDA

#### APPROVAL

- 1.1. Approval of the GFC Meeting #581 April 8, 2024 Agenda
- 1.2. Approval of the GFC Meeting #580 March 4, 2024 Minutes

#### INFORMATION

- 1.3. GFC Executive Committee Report – April 2, 2024
- 1.4. GFC Executive Committee Approved Minutes – #563 – February 26, 2024

MOTION:

gfc.2024.04.01

Preston/Massey

*That the General Faculties Council approve the April 8, 2024 Consent Agenda.*

Motion: Carried

D. Jayas gave some background on how the consent agenda is structured. There was a question on procedure items particularly regarding the sports dome. J. Gallais gave some procedural recommendations/information on this being consistent with past practices. There was some confusion on whether GFC has to approve items before they go to the Board. The Chair gave background on what the PSLA states with the president being responsible for bringing feedback to the board no matter what the feedback is. It was noted that GFC can make either a formal motion and/or the feedback is relayed to the board.

---

## **2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

D. Jayas referred to the President's Report that was included in the agenda package.

A few highlights and additions were noted:

- Announcement by Provincial Government of the investment in the rural medical program in collaboration with the University of Calgary. We were given \$43.2 million to renovate the Community Centre for Wellbeing with more funding given to the UofC for operating the program - some of which will flow to the UofL.
- Meeting in Medicine Hat with the premier as that is her constituency. Topics discussed surrounded the rural medicine program as well as the needs of the UofL such as water research, neuroscience and the possibility of engineering program. The international student cap was also discussed. The IRCC processing is taking longer than we hoped so we still don't know what our international student numbers will be in the fall.

## **3. QUESTION PERIOD**

One question was submitted in advance.

- J. Mather – Water saving and usage – could we get an update on what are we doing? It was noted that the sustainability plan is going to the board for approval at the next meeting. N. Walker responded that Facilities is working on a plan but we have received no instruction from city/province or the LNID yet. We are determining who are the major water users and we plan on meeting with a small working group with representatives from those groups. We have limited water usage except for around buildings for fire prevention. They are looking at various water saving methods across campus including not draining the pool, toilet auto flush, as well as turning off the humidity in some of the buildings. It was noted by D. Jayas that wherever the humidity is needed, it will not be turned off.
- J. Mather wondered about the sustainability plan and funding. R. Barley and Jennifer have 3-4 students who want to do an applied studies this summer on sustainability. What are the problems that the students should be focussing on. D. McMartin will have a conversation with J. Mather. Earth day is coming up and we will have a launch

then on the plan, if approved by the Board. There is much happening but we are still gathering information.

- D. Slomp – what is being done in housing for the summer? N. Walker noted that there are not as many students in housing then but they have asked the department to conserve water. They will be sending out information to the campus community on what they can do to help out.
- J. Rice noted that Saskatchewan got more international student numbers. Is that something that our government would advocate for? M. Helstein responded that Saskatchewan’s initial allocation was lower than Alberta’s and we are not aware of the plan yet.
- R. Preston asked for an update on Navitas. M. Helstein reported that we are waiting on the UICC (Navitas) partnership numbers. The province has not moved on the PAL for those institutions yet. We don’t have a sense of how many students will be coming at this time. If the government doesn’t move quickly, it will limit our students being able to move through the process and get here for the fall term.
- J. Mather – asked again about bird strikes and to turn off lights in the Science Commons. She found information on some research studies and has passed that on to the Governance Office. N. Walker responded that we still have funding for student research. The Science Commons is intended to be a 24-hour building. The lights are on a schedule in the hallways and set to turn on at 6:00 am. Labs are not on a timer. We can change the on/off schedule but need to be aware that some staff such as the Caretakers start at 5:00 am. D. Jayas reported that the Science Commons is a research building so lights are based on the use in the building.
- A request was made to be mindful of the time to move forward in the agenda.

#### 4. ITEMS FOR ACTION

##### 4.1.GFC Admission Standards Committee Reports

##### 4.1.1. Report 1 – For immediate Implementation

##### **Student Enrolment & Registrar Services**

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.02

Buis Deering/Reiter

*That GFC approve the addition of a misrepresentation/fraudulent document policy to the international student admission sections of the graduate and undergraduate calendars.*

Motion: Carried

This is related to fraudulent documents specifically the increase in fraudulent letters of admission.

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.03

Buis Deering/Scott

*That GFC approve the addition of a challenged/fraudulent payments policy to the graduate and undergraduate calendars.*

Motion: Carried

This is related to stolen credit cards and fees that are charged for fraudulent payments.

#### 4.1.2. Report 2 – Implementation May 1, 2025

##### **Faculty of Health Sciences**

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.03

Doan/Letts

*That GFC approve updates to the Bachelor of Health Sciences in Addictions Counselling admission requirements, effective May 1, 2025.*

Motion: Carried

## **5. ITEM FOR DISCUSSION**

### 5.1. 2024 – 2025 Budget

D. Jayas invited N. Walker to introduce the budget. GFC has the opportunity to comment on the budget and these comments will be passed on to the board when they approve the document at their next meeting. This year is balanced but future years are not as we don't know what the operating budget or grant will be. We will revisit the budget once we know what the international student numbers will be to determine if there needs to be any changes. C. Kanashiro gave some background on the budget process and thanked her team. The values of the university are considered when they work on the budget. We develop an initial budget and then work to balance it. The budget advisory committee is key in the consultation process. The difference between continuing and one time funding that makes up the budget was discussed. Continuing – has two categories – unrestricted and restricted funding that can be used for projects. Restricted can only be used for specific projects that they were approved for. Unrestricted funding is more flexible in use for programming. The overall reductions since 2009-10 are nearly 30 million dollars. We are managing the budget in part with fees on international enrolments. There are some revenue generating projects that are being worked on such as micro credit and non credential programming, and the south campus development. C. Kanashiro gave the budget website information for if anyone wants further information.

The floor was opened for questions. Questions arose on the non-bargaining unit compensation and the hope for the classification review to stabilize staffing; staffing in regards to temporary and permanent hires was noted along with how replacements are managed. The risks of budgeting using the international numbers with the PALS were mentioned and we are being conservative. There was a short discussion on sustainability funding and one time funding as well as the government expectations of the institution to increase our funding through revenue generation and tuition.

### 5.2. 2024 – 2029 Capital Projects Priorities

N. Walker spoke about the capital plan and budget for the government of which they only look at the top 3 but we put all of our wish list projects on it. GFC was updated on the funding to renovate the Community Centre for Wellbeing. Destination phase II was noted and we are looking at more student housing and a dining hall as well as capital lease holdings in Calgary due to space constraints at Bow Valley College. Sustainability projects such as solar may be in the near future. We are looking at switching Hepler Hall to become a receiving station for raw materials. We also want to have more consultation in capital projects. It was noted that this document is submitted to government and we don't know what they may be interested in funding. We prioritize things but they don't necessarily get funded in the order it is presented. It was clarified that the housing in UHall is separated from phase II as it is an ancillary project which the government won't fund.

### 5.3. Destination Phase II - Governance

M. Helstein and N. Walker introduced the topic. The Provost reported that as part of a previous plan, three million dollars was received for planning for Destination Phase II. They are looking to have a working group to guide this project as we did for the Science Commons. This will bring facilities and academics together to find the right expertise for the project. Discussion occurred on membership requirements around inclusion of instructors and potentially excluded departments. It was reported that there will be much consultation on this project. There was further discussion on safety standards as well as representation of fine arts faculty and art gallery representation.

### 5.4. Multi-Sports Dome Proposal Update

D. Jayas introduced the document and the feedback that was all raised at various groups. N. Walker stated that they have tried to respond to all the questions that were raised by people in all of the consultations. The external funding recommendation for 10% external funding came from the feedback. Our current facilities can not keep up with demand. The internal financing will be paid back and allow us to use these funds again for other projects. We are putting strategic priority in building relationships with external community on this project. It was noted that B. Halma and N. Langevin were in attendance to assist with any questions. The floor was opened for questions, and a significant discussion occurred on this.

*(Please find the summary of the themes of the conversation and then the motions following.)*

Of the feedback that was heard, three broad themes of questions/concerns emerged: One - The Process and Consultation; Two - Funding and Budget; Three - Logistics on the Building Process and Operations. There was also some support for the project.

### **Theme One – The Process and Consultation**

The questions and comments here were around the process of approving these projects, the role of GFC and what student/faculty consultation was done. There was a general feeling that this project came up quickly and consultation was still lacking (particularly with students and in relation to fees specifically) and that a lack of student voices in support of the project was concerning given the project is in part rationalized as a benefit to them. It was also stated that there may not be much faculty support either as there is a feeling these funds should support other academic or student projects.

### **Theme Two – Funding and Budget**

The second theme was on budget implications of funding this project. Does this negatively impact our operating budget or significantly undermine our reserves in a moment of continued budget uncertainty? How does this impact the interconnection of reserves, strategic priorities and operating dollars? Can we provide additional information on other priorities that have been funded? Does it introduce new operating budget demands (like insurance)? Are we choosing this over something else, and if so there could be other choices for students such as food security or housing assistance? Is there a catastrophic worst-case scenario in relation to the budget projections and what will that mean?

### **Theme Three - Logistics on the Building Process and Operations.**

The third theme was around access, risks of the building structure, programming needs and environmental impact.

There were some questions of clarification on inconsistencies in the document, which developed as the document evolved in response to feedback (for example, about academic use and in which spaces). A number of other concerns which arose here are ones that GFC members acknowledged are addressed in the document, but that they wished to express their disagreement with (for example, whether there should be new building on campus at all, whether any approval should be granted in advance of a full environmental impact assessment, and whether a quickly depreciating, short life span building, is the right choice).

There was disagreement by the majority of members present at GFC but there were also some points in support of the project not captured in the themes above.

### **Positives**

It was noted that in looking at recruiting prospective students, facilities is, for some, a consideration in their decision. Institutions, including the UofL, have seen a bump in enrolment after new facilities have been opened. There is strong student use of current facilities, and a lack of capacity that requires we rent other spaces to meet student need or limit access. Dome creates more opportunity both within current facilities and within the dome itself. An acknowledgement that a more diverse array of activities could be supported through the dome, and that research does demonstrate the link between physical activity and recreation and positive mental health impacts. The need to diversify how we spend strategic priority funds, including opportunities like this that allow us to spend this money twice was also noted as a benefit as the money will flow back for annual use, and this building will diversify our revenue sources.

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.04

Preston/Barrett

*That GFC continue on past 5:00 pm for 30 minutes.*

Motion: Carried

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.05

Preston/Barrett

*That GFC continue on past 5:30 pm for 30 minutes.*

Motion: Carried

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.06

Preston/Reiter

*That GFC continue on past 6:00 pm for 30 minutes.*

Motion: Carried

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.07

Burton/Mather

*To continue the discussion of the multi-sports dome at the next meeting in May.*

Motion: Defeated

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.08

Marynowski/Seconded

*That GFC end the debate on the motion on the floor.*

Motion: Defeated (2/3 approval required)

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.09

Dobbie/Starr

*That GFC support the building of the dome.*

Motion: Defeated (23 opposed/13 for/2 abstained)

A secret ballot was requested so the Chair asked for a motion to continue the meeting past 6:30 pm to accommodate the voting process.

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.10  
Preston/Reiter

*That GFC continue on past 6:30 pm for 15 minutes.*

Motion: Carried

D. Jayas will relay the lack of GFC support of the multi sport dome to the board for their information.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: gfc.2024.04.11

Buis Deering/Anderson Bain

*That the GFC meeting of April 8, 2024 be adjourned.*

Motion: Carried