OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Jelena Holovati, Vice-Chair GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC), Associate Professor

The Vice-Chair began by acknowledging the territory:

Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that the University of Alberta resides on Treaty 6 territory and the homeland of the Métis. To acknowledge the territory is to recognize the longer history of these lands and signifies our commitment to working in Good Relations with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples as we engage in our institutional work.

Motion: Fassih/Leighton

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve the agenda. CARRIED

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of December 8, 2021

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Consent Agenda Mover and Seconder: Andersen/Padfield

THAT the GFC Academic Planning Committee approve the open session minutes of December 8, 2021. CARRIED
DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. Faculty of Education restructuring
Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Jennifer Tupper; Dean, Faculty of Education; Lynn McGarvey, Vice Dean, Faculty of Education

Purpose of the Proposal: The proposal is before the committee to provide a briefing on changes to the Faculty of Education department structure that were recently approved by the Education Faculty Council, and will be coming before APC in October for recommendation.

Discussion:
The Vice-Chair noted that this item was back on the APC agenda for discussion for a second time and that it would be coming to APC and GFC for recommendation in February, 2022.

Dr Tupper provided an update on the work that had been done since the proposal had come to APC for discussion in September, 2021. She explained that there had been some governance work in light of discussion in the Faculty about the membership of the Education Faculty Council (EFC), in particular the presence of Graduate students and the ability of faculty members on sabbatical to serve on EFC. These matters were clarified and approved in the form of changes to the EFC Terms of Reference at a special meeting of EFC. Subsequently, the proposal that had been approved was brought back to the EFC where a motion to reconsider was proposed and approved and the original motion was put back on the table for decision by EFC. The motion passed with a small majority and as per the EFC Terms of Reference, a second vote was held to confirm. The second vote confirmed the motion had carried.

Dr Tupper then asked Vice-Dean Lynn McGarvey to present on the proposal. Dr McGarvey presented the rationale for the proposed non-departmentalised structure as well as some of the work that has been done since the EFC approval to advance planning for implementation in July, 2022. In particular, members heard about the consultation that had taken place since September especially with student associations, students and student groups, the EFC, and a Faculty of Education Restructuring Conversation townhall. She also provided information about a Steering Committee that had been struck to lead the restructuring process with elected and appointed members. Several working groups have also been composed of faculty and staff members with the support of resources members to work on governance, leadership, Communities of Practice/Pods, and administration.

Members asked questions, heard responses, made comments, and expressed opinions, including:
- The impact on the School of School of Library and Information Studies (SLIS) and their accreditation status, and a request that SLIS be included in the graphic for the restructure;
- That SLIS’ school council will continue to have autonomy over decision making and that the accreditation standards would be distributed to APC;
- That compliance with accreditation standards is a priority for the steering committee;
- That the term “school” used in SLIS does not relate to the definition of “school council” set out in section 28(1) of the Post-secondary Learning Act (PSLA), that the definition of SLIS fits closer to a Department Council;
- What the existing program areas are, whether there would be new programs created, and if there would be program coordinator positions created;
- That the academic restructuring was separate from the ongoing efforts to renew programs;
- That there may be program changes inspired by the collaboration anticipated through academic renewal;
- Recognition for the significant consultation that has taken place since the proposal was presented in September and the clear emphasis on the role of graduate students in the success of the Faculty;
- How collaboration would be supported for decision-making that might impact graduate students, for example course offerings, supervision and funding allocation (TAships, RAships etc.)
− The planned mechanisms for thinking through the needs of masters and doctoral students to ensure that graduate student support is maintained and enhanced wherever possible;
− Whether the proposal offered opportunities for interdisciplinarity and a suggestion to flesh out these possibilities in the proposal; and
− Advice to how to clarify the roles of leaders, the impact on research, and academic programs in the proposal.

4.  2021/22 Undergraduate Enrolment Report
Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Melissa Padfield, Vice-Provost and Registrar; Anna Hughes, Associate Registrar (Enrolment)

Purpose of the Proposal: To discuss the Annual Report on Undergraduate Enrolment

Discussion:
The Vice-Chair noted that this report would be discussed at the Council on Student Affairs (COSA) and provided for information to General Faculties Council.

Ms Padfield introduced the 9th annual report and noted the unique impacts of COVID-19 that influenced the 2021-2022 enrolment cycle. She provided information on student demographics and the ability for students to self-identify. Ms Padfield explained that the report contains information on total enrolment data, admission rates, the applicant pool, and completion rates. Looking forward, Ms Padfield emphasised the importance of the institutional enrolment objectives and the University’s goals for equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI).

Members asked about the proportion of male to female student members, whether this was a concern and what the University was planning to do in response. Ms Padfield responded that gender diversity is a priority for enrolment management and that the University is in alignment with other universities across the country. She noted several possible reasons for the trends.

Ms Padfield was asked to summarize the strengths and weaknesses set out in the report and she celebrated the retention rates and noted concerns of integrated enrolment management that takes into account the movement of students between programs and within the University. She expressed hope for the current cycle with the number of offers, acceptance rates, and the decrease in the withdrawal rates.

The relatively low number of students who self-declared as “other” was questioned and Ms Padfield explained that since this option was relatively recent, it may not have been available over the entire student lifecycle for the full student body. She also explained that a perceived decrease in enrolment of students from China was actually related to the total proportion of International students. She emphasized that China continues to be a priority for the University and that through there had been a relative decrease, she was hopeful that the total number of students would hold even if the proportion continued to shrink.

Members also wondered about the socio-economic status of students and Ms Padfield explained that there was a lower application rate for students with an average household income of under 100K$ but there is a high yield for that student population whereas students from higher income households appear to have more options and the yield is subsequently lower.

Members also asked about the value of comparator data from U15 institutions and whether the EDI goals were made explicit in some way. Ms Padfield explained that while census data has traditionally been lacking, they are starting to have enough data to establish multivariate data about student identity. This data will be useful for everything from enrolment management to student services and programs. This could be used eventually to establish institutional objectives.
Ms Padfield provided information on the University’s growth plan including the use of entrance averages to manage enrolment. She expressed a hope that this approach will prevent a “race to 100” where entrance averages are used to manage enrolment and noted other strategies currently used to manage growth.

5. University of Alberta for Tomorrow (UAT) - Service Excellence Transformation (SET) Progress Update
   (no documents)

*Presenter(s):* Rob Munro, Executive Lead, Service Excellence Transformation

*Discussion:*
Mr Munro noted that the SET progress continues with several phases wrapping up. A high-level overview of the work on Human Resources, Shared Services, Student Services, Space and Facilities, Procurement, and Faculty restructuring was provided. In addition, the process is moving forward to reduce faculty burden for program areas like marketing, communications and research administration.

Members asked questions and for clarification on:
- The service standards for Information Services and Technology and student services;
- That shared services represents a significant shift in service delivery for the University and that it represents hundreds of process changes;
- That the Enterprise Service Management System will be sunsetting in a future phase and an RFP is being tendered;
- That the goal is to have the Student Service Center resolve 80% of inquiries in a thoughtful way. Currently, the turnaround time is about one week (this represents status quo from the previous system) but the goal is to move towards a 2-3 day turnaround time.
- That service governance models are being contemplated that would support quality improvement over the long term;
- Whether some of the service disruptions to eClass are related to the SET transformation and that in general, they were unrelated.

6. Budget Update (standing item)

*Presenter(s):* Todd Gilchrist, Vice-President (University Services and Finance)

*Discussion:*
Mr Gilchrist began with an overview of the fiscal year 2021-2022 and reported that there was a modest surplus anticipated, mostly explained by the sale of properties that led to greater than expected revenues. He also noted that research revenues are trending over target overall, especially with some recent large funding announcements. He reminded members that this does not address the University budget deficit and that the March 9th meeting of APC will include the 2021-2022 budget proposal. Mr Gilchrist also reported that the extraordinary tuition proposals have been approved and that these proposals support improvements to the student experience. Meetings with student groups have begun for tuition increases at 7% for both undergraduate and graduate students and the University plans to revert back to tuition increases aligned with the consumer price index (CPI). Inflation continues to be a concern and is being monitored for the impact on spending. There is a reduction in contribution rates for both Universities Academic Pension Plan and the Public Service Pension Plan which will lead to a decrease in the contribution from the government. Finally, Mr Gilchrist reported there will need to be an accounting policy change to move to new asset requirement obligations.

**INFORMATION REPORTS**
Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

7. Work-Integrated Learning - Administrative Terminations

8. Briefing Note: Supplementary Information on UAT/College Metrics
CLOSING SESSION

9. Adjournment
   - Next Meeting of APC: February 9, 2022
   - Next Meeting of GFC: January 31, 2022

The Vice-Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.