



GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL MEETING #587

Approved Minutes

Monday, December 9, 2024

3:00 p.m. in W646

- Present:** D. Jayas, (Chair), O. Awosoga, Y. Belanger (virtually), J. Blum, N. Buis Deering, C. Burton, C. Carnaghan, J. Cunningham, H. Davis-Fisch, Y. Dixit (virtually), J. Doan, J. Dobbie, A. Dymond (virtually), A. Ebenmelu, A. Enigbokan, S. Findlay (virtually), J. Ford, D. Gaur, B. Gerwin, P. Ghazalian (virtually), K. Godfrey (virtually), K. Greenwood, M. Helstein, C. Hopkinson, B. Hughes, K. Ito, H. Jansen, S. Johnsrude, I. Kovalchuk (virtually), M. Letts, D. Lucas, K. Massey, J. Mather, D. McMartin, L. Michael, E. Mundell (virtually), A. Oblak (virtually), J. Oldfield (virtually), N. Patel, S. Pelech, N. Rebry, J. Reiter (virtually), J. Rice, Y. Sackey-Forson, R. Schiff, K. Schwarz, L. Starr, C. Steinke, R. Sutherland (virtually), A. Taylor, M. Thomas, P. Visentin, L. Vogelsang, P. Wilson, J. Wiltshire (virtually), J. Youngdahl, D. Zalesak
- Regrets:** S. Alam, O. Kovalchuk, C. Mattatall, D. McNeill, W. Osborn, D. Scott, D. Slomp, J. Sumbera, S. Thomas, G. Tian, A. von Heyking,
- Other:** A. Chubb, G. DeSteur (virtually), J. Gallais, V. Grisack, 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. A moment of silence was held for M. Sinclair, former Canadian senator, Terry Moore, former faculty member in and international student Hei Wai (Tony) Ho.

M. Thomas gave some background on the Pass the Hat Fundraiser to raise funds for the student union food bank. The donations are all digital this year.

1. CONSENT AGENDA

APPROVAL

- 1.1. Approval of the GFC Meeting #587 December 9, 2024 Agenda
- 1.2. Approval of the GFC Meeting #586 November 4, 2024 Minutes

INFORMATION

- 1.3. GFC Executive Committee Report – December 2, 2024
- 1.4. GFC Executive Committee Approved Minutes – #570 – October 28, 2024 Meeting

MOTION: gfc.2024.12.01
Awosoga/M. Thomas

That the General Faculties Council approve the December 9, 2024 Consent Agenda.

Motion: Carried

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:

- The Max Bell pool has reopened on November 12th.
- Luxie Lifts –Pronghorn athletes are providing a ride home for you and your car. Please support them if you need a ride.
- Martha Mathurin Moe's Vice Provost role has been realigned to Vice-Provost Accessibility, Belonging and Community. The name change better reflects the scope of work.
- Calgary Campus – the space in the Campus Alberta building is not serving our needs so we have started exploring new space. We are working with the provincial government for funding.
- Branding project – initiated to align our brand with the strategic plan. We have not done a branding since 2015 and need to update our branding to attract students as well as to clearly communicate who we are. There was an email sent out with a link to get further information. The design phase will be developed after January when the consultation process is completed. We will roll out some testing in the spring of 2025.

2.1. Questions Received in Advance

- None

2.2. Question Period on Report Items

- One question received from B. Gerwin will be addressed in 7.1
- C. Burton asked for clarification on the space in the Calgary campus. It was confirmed that we are looking at other spaces.
- C. Burton asked for M. Mathurin Moe's new title to be repeated.
- P. Wilson asked if the change is due to government prompting. M. Helstein noted that it better reflects the scope of the work that the Vice-Provost's office is doing and supporting across many campus units. Additionally, these are the broader themes that were captured within the strategic planning consultations – the terms make the same commitments but are more inclusive of the broad set of work that is being supported. Acknowledged that there have been shifts at other post-secondary institutions.
- M. Thomas requested information on the name change process and whether those doing the work were consulted. M. Helstein reported that M. Mathurin Moe and her team have been involved in the process, and have also been consulting broadly with colleagues at other universities acknowledging we have a unique provincial context. The strategic planning process gave us a reason to reflect on the work that is being done, and ensuring that the name reflects that scope of work.

3. ITEMS FOR ACTION

3.1. GFC Admission Standards Committee Report

Report 1 – Implementation Immediately
Student Enrolment & Registrar Services

MOTION:
Buis Deering/Rice

gfc.2024.12.02

That GFC approve updates to the Undergraduate and Graduate ELP requirements for the Duolingo English Test, for immediate implementation.

Motion: Carried

3.2. Dhillon School of Business Adjunct Professor Policy Guidelines

MOTION:
Godfrey/Enigbokan

gfc.2023.12.03

That General Faculties Council approve the Dhillon School of Business Adjunct Professor Policy Guidelines, as attached.

Motion: Carried

It was noted that the proposed change is very thorough in the appendix but there was some unease with the way it is framed. What can the adjunct do for the UofL instead of what the UofL can do for the adjunct. The adjunct policy has been through the consultation piece. It included what the pieces that are mutually beneficial to both parties and then asked the faculties to develop guidelines that are more specific. There are lots of adjuncts tied to research or grad students. K. Godfrey reported that there is a need for people to be engaged in the school (appendix b) especially for the accreditation pieces. This is not absolute. M. Helstein added that an adjunct may or may not come with an employment contract. Some may have a sessional contract or being paid as an Elder. The adjunct is an honorific piece and the payment piece is separate. D. Jayas noted that Adjunct status gives scholars the ability to apply for research funding. It was asked how many adjuncts we have? M. Helstein will bring the number back to GFC.

4. ITEMS FOR REVIEW (Prior to Board Action)

4.1. GFC Strategic Planning Committee – Strategic Plan

MOTION:
Helstein/M. Thomas

gfc.2023.12.04

That GFC accepts the recommendation of the GFC Strategic Planning Committee to the Board of Governors for the approval of the attached Strategic Plan.

Motion: Carried

M. Helstein introduced the motion before starting the discussion. The plan has the addition of the feedback we received. There were some formatting changes. On page 30 there is a draft version of the launch plan. Some things that could be highlighted through the design aspects were changed – i.e. the numbers were removed in a list so they don't

prioritize any parts of the plan. The other major change since the last GFC is in regard to the action items. We have narrowed the action items and linked them to the goals.

There was further discussion on values, beliefs and virtues.

D. Jayas will inform the board that GFC has recommended the Strategic Plan unanimously.

5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

5.1. GFC Library Committee Presentation

H. Jansen gave a brief entertaining presentation on the GFC Library Committee.

5.2. Destination Project Phase II Update

M. Helstein updated GFC on the Destination Project Phase II. This will be a standing item on the GFC agenda every few meetings to keep the body updated on the progress.

The ad hoc committee are looking for approval today on the design portion of the project and this will go to the board for approval later this week. The GFC Ad Hoc Destination Project Phase II Steering Committee will guide the work.

6. ITEMS FOR PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION

6.1. Approaches to the Emeritus Policy

M. Helstein introduced the possible changes that could be made to update the university's Emeritus Policy. The feedback received was that we needed to update this policy. We have tried to give you a sense of how people are using emeritus status and wanted to have the discussion to gather more feedback on which direction we should go. There are two possible avenues to pursue. We do not want to take a path that creates a lot of workload across the faculty.

The discussion began with the differences between emeritus vs retired faculty (benefits are coming from the agreement with the Retired Faculty Association). Emeritus status is more honorific. They can also apply for funding/grants with this title. It was asked what people do with this status. M. Helstein reported that if you retire as a full professor, you are granted emeritus status. There are also some senior administration emeritus pieces in the policy. We would need to survey people to find out what they are using it for.

Instructors and professional librarians currently can not get this status. J. Gallais reported that about 150 people are currently allowed to use the title and for some positions like Chancellor emeriti the benefits are relational. There was further discussion around how other institutions grant the status and that this status doesn't cost us any extra resources to award. The members also discussed time limits or a minimum number of years to gain the title.

M. Helstein concluded the discussion by noting this is not a GFC policy but we wanted input from GFC members. It will not come back for approval but she requested that members add their feedback when the final policy changes come up for review.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

7.1. Question Period on Other Items

- B. Gerwin had sent this question after the deadline and was asked to bring it up here: I'm new to GFC, but my impression is that GFC as such has not had much opportunity to meaningfully discuss the development of the South Campus lands, as

part of “campus planning” and “building program”, which are within the authority of GFC according to the PSLA (Section 26.1.o).

A request that this opportunity for discussion be brought early in the New Year. This is quite urgent given the speed at which the U of L Business Corp seems to be moving with its development plans.

D. Jayas gave a timeline of when the south campus development was discussed at GFC. The board would have taken this all into account before approving the independent entity. D. Jayas noted that we need to have this development at arms length to protect the university’s charitable status. They are doing the consultation on the land for revenue generation and are having public consultations. If you wish, we can ask the entity to come give a presentation of where they are in the process.

A comment arose on the process seeming to contradict both the strategic plan and campus sustainability plans. Indigenization is not realized in this plan. A concern about an Indigenous member not being on the board was noted. D. Jayas responded that there were no Indigenous applicants but that they are engaging Indigenous consultation with Elders and the community. Food security is not addressed. It is sidestepping the authority of this body as well as not following the strategic plan that we just approved. The food insecurity piece was addressed by student in that they are looking to have a grocery store there as well as maybe have the food stores accept Bridge Bucks. It will also look at affordable housing and student jobs in this development. It was also noted that the ULBC being separate is completed already so now communication is key moving forward. The SU engaged with M. Kelly to bring their questions and concerns in the discussion to this entity. Groups on campus that want to give feedback, should contact the entity as the UofL cannot give direction. A request will be made to come speak.

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:

gfc.2024.12.05

Awosoga/Oblak

That the GFC meeting of December 9, 2024 be adjourned.

Motion: Carried