

EXEC GPO Work Plan and Meeting Notes

LINKS TO OTHER RESOURCES:

- [Principles for General Faculties Council Delegation of Authority](#)
- [Principles for General Faculties Council Standing Committee Composition](#)
- [Post-Secondary Learning Act \(PSLA\)](#)

Meeting Date	ITEM	Link to Current ToR and Template	GPO Meeting Notes	Approval and Review date	Approval and Consultation Pathway
Apr 4, 2022 Jan 23, 2023 October 23, 2023 November 27, 2023 January 22, 2024	GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC)	Current APC ToR APC Review Template	<p><u>April 2, 2024</u> -</p> <p><u>March 4, 2024</u> - Members discussed the February 26, 2024 GFC meeting and the feedback from GFC members. University Secretary J Lemieux presented a change to composition in light of member concerns that the proportion of student voices was diminished by the addition of ex officio and academic staff members. The six additional members were removed from the draft and members agreed to review composition in a parallel process so that composition might be more systematically addressed in ToR.</p> <p><u>February 5, 2024</u> - Members reviewed the latest version of the APC Terms of Reference and suggested that it was ready for discussion at Exec and GFC.</p> <p><u>January 22, 2024</u> - Members reviewed the changes made following the meeting on November 27 2023. - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The definition of “school” within the terms of reference and whether the language in the proposed draft gives more flexibility for academic units in the University to call themselves “schools” - How to prevent confusion between “schools” as defined in the PSLA and other uses of the label <i>school</i> within the University. </p>	ToR approved: April 2019 Review date: April 2022	<i>Tentative Path:</i> Discussion: APC Feb 1, 2023 (Feedback)

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<p><u>November 27, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of new language that clarifies the responsibility of APC over tuition and fee proposals; - A suggestion to update the title of the Collective Agreement; - The definition of “school”, “department”, “chair”, “college”; - Whether Colleges fall under the responsibility of APC; - The increase in the number of members and the agreement that the additional <i>ex officio</i> members, academic staff, and students made sense; - Whether the composition should be limited to full-time academic staff or if part-time academic staff should be eligible to put their names forward for at-large seats; - Whether APC can make revisions to existing academic awards and a suggestion to clarify the limitation to GFC’s authority; - It was necessary to note each time that GFC’s authority is subject to the authority of the Board; and - How repeating the limitation on GFC’s authority by the Board could limit the sense of agency of GFC members and whether this should be added instead to the interpretations sections to ensure that GFC members feel empowered to make decisions; - Limitations to APC’s authority to recommend to the Board on budget matters; and - The authority of GFC and APC when it comes to changes to the Long-Range Development Plan. <p><u>October 23, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed addition of authority from the Facilities Development Committee (FDC) and explicit references to the PSLA; - The Board delegated authority held by GFC and currently delegated to FDC; - The mechanisms to ensure shared jurisdiction between GFC and the Board including cross-appointed membership, regular attendance of Board members to GFC; and recommendations to the Board; - That Facilities was already part of APC’s delegated authority and that reinforcing their responsibility with delegated authority currently held by FDC might make sense; 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members concluded that the APC terms of reference review was a priority and University Governance committed to providing draft changes in a new template in advance of the next meeting. <p><u>Apr 4, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where does research sit and how is it looked at by the committee? - 2017 ad hoc recommendation to add Research to the name and why GFC chose not to. - Is APC talking about the research mission and support for that mission? - Budget, tuition, and budget implications and what this means for APC. - How do other Alberta institutions and our U15 comparators approve budgets and tuition? - Consideration of facilities authority pending GFC's decision about FDC. <p><u>Jan 23, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion deferred 		
Jan 23, 2023 October 23, 2023	GFC Committee on the Learning Environment	Current CLE ToR CLE Review Template	<p><u>April 2, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed composition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addition of the UASU VP (Student Life) should be included instead of an UG at-large student elected by GFC - Addition of a second graduate student member - The balance of ex officio to elected GFC members - A suggestion to remove the appointed teaching award winner and the association chair with teaching expertise - Members reviewed general principles for committee composition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 1971 principles did not include committee composition - The need to keep committee size reasonable - Members reviewed committee responsibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changed the language on Assessment and Grading regulation; - Adding a limitation to authority where changes are substantial; - Clarifying that statistical summaries will also include residence stats - The inclusion of the COSB in the CLESA ToR <p><u>March 4, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - K Peters presented proposed changes to the CLE ToR, noting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addition of authority over libraries, student affairs and student conduct; 	ToR approved: November 2019 Review date: November 2022	<i>Tentative Path:</i> Discussion: CLE Jan 25, 2023 (Feedback)

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification of responsibilities over regulation on assessment and evaluation of teaching; and - Addition of the Dean of Students. - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limitations to the language in the PSLA and the lack of clarity over “appointment of examiners” for example; - The changing face of pedagogy and whether CLE should have an explicit role in shaping pedagogy or teaching related activities such as the work of the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL); - Whether CLE should receive annual reports from administrative units supporting teaching such as Community Service Learning, CTL, Experiential Learning, etc.; - Combining the authority over facilities with the authority over academic planning; - Whether “regulations”, “procedures” and the University Calendar could be defined; - Suggestions to clarify the definition of “faculty”, “SPOT”, and “Discipline”; and - How to differentiate between assessment of student learning and student evaluation of teaching; - Members reviewed the format of the terms of reference and expressed concerns that the it would be difficult for GFC members to follow where the authority and responsibilities of CLE were now captured in the proposed ToR. They noted that labels were too general and that members would need to be oriented to the new format. They concluded that the interpretation guidelines will help to clarify authority; - The term “learning environment” and how to ensure that student engagement, student educational experience, and support for teaching were covered by the ToR; - Composition, and whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SU VP(A) could be added in lieu of the President; - Whether the Student Residence Association member was necessary; and - The need for non-voting resource members with expertise on student affairs. - Whether the new approach to Student Conduct and Student Academic Integrity was sufficiently clear in the terms of reference. <p><u>February 5, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - University Secretary J Lemieux noted the approach for the CLE ToR review would be the same as for APC and PC. 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - He asked the committee to provide feedback on an idea that the CLE might include authority currently delegated to the Student Conduct and Policy Committee (SCPC) going forward. - K Mundel, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives) and Chair of CLE reflected on the ideas and noted the alignment with the authorities currently held by CLE including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exam Regulation; - Experiential Learning; and - The learning environment. - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many decisions are made by SCPC; - The function of the Practicum Intervention Policy; - Who chairs the Committee on the Learning Environment and whether the Dean of Students is a member of the Committee; <p><u>October 23, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The limited delegated authority held by CLE concerning approval of student evaluation of teaching questions and policies on student assessment; - The advantages of aligning language with the statutory powers set out in the Act - specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct of Evaluations and Examinations - PSLA s. 26(1)(e) - Supervision of Student Affairs (PSLA s 31(1) and - PSLA s.(1) - Whether other authority set out in the PSLA was relevant to CLE's mandate, especially section 19(d) regarding furnishing and equipping facilities; - Whether CLE required University Governance support. - Members concluded that CLE was less urgent than FDC or APC but that there was overlapping authority so the terms should be reviewed concurrently. - University Governance committed to tracking feedback from the committee that was relevant to CLE's terms of reference. <p><u>Jan 23</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion Deferred 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
Jan 24, 2022 Feb 7, 2022 October 23, 2023 January 22, 2024	GFC Facilities Development Committee (FDC)	Current FDC ToR FDC 3-Year Review Template	<p><u>January 22, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the tabled motion to disband the FDC in light of the proposed changes to the APC Terms of Reference. They discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The duplication that will exist if the delegated authority from the Board and the powers to recommend on facilities are moved to APC; and - The process to pull from the table the motion to disband GFC. - They agreed to discuss this possibility with the GFC Executive Committee. <p><u>October 23, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members reviewed the work of GPO in 2021-2022 to articulate a proposal to disband the FDC and the tabling of the motion and subsequent rescission of sub-delegated authority; and - They discussed the history of FDC and requested background information; <p><u>Jan 24, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GPO members had questions about the amount of work that would be transferred to other committees but generally comfortable with disbanding FDC and moving authority to APC and CLE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion that F&O report regularly to committees and annually to GFC (IAMS?) - Suggestion that there be some kind of oversight of the management of research space <p><u>Feb 7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General Space Programs, their expense and rarity - the staffing categories in the composition - the alignment of APC's mandate and matters related to research space - the interconnectedness of teaching and research - Members agreed that this should go forward to Exec for discussion and recommendation to move the authorities to APC and CLE but noted that it was important to highlight that this was a two-pronged process with the current authority being moved right now to ensure no gap in decision-making but that these authorities would be examined in depth when APC and CLE ToRs were reviewed in fall 2022. 	ToR approved: Oct 30, 2017 Review date: Oct 2020	Discussion: Exec Feb 14, 2022 GFC Mar 21, 2022 Action: EXEC Apr 11, 2022 (Recommended) GFC Jun 6, 2022 (Tabled)

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
<p>October 23, 2023 January 22, 2024 February 5, 2024</p>	<p>GFC Programs Committee (PC)</p>	<p>Current PC ToR PC 3-Year Review Template</p>	<p><u>March 4, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Committee reviewed the revised draft and noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of an additional ex officio member, the Vice-Provost (EDI); - Concerns about the sub-delegation of authority to the Provost and how members of PC would flag issues with approvals; and - The need for clarity and transparency of decisions made with delegated authority; - Members discussed at some length the proposed change to remove three appointed members from Campus Saint-Jean (CSJ), Faculty of Native Studies (FNS); and Augustana Campus. They heard that these seats were effectively additional ex officio members and that the committee composition was out of alignment with the GFC Principles for Committee Composition. Members made suggestions and discussed alternatives including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether GFC members from CSJ, FNS and Augustana could be asked to sit on the committee; - Whether Nominating Committee (NC) could give preference to members from smaller stand-alone faculties; and - That there were several faculties that had only one seat on GFC who were similarly underrepresented on GFC Standing Committees. - Members concluded that it made sense to remove the members because they were in effect ex officio members appointed by their deans. <p><u>February 5, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Committee reviewed the changes and discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approval of course and minor program changes by the Vice-Provost (Programs) after review by PST; - Who will determine what falls into the category of “major” - Whether there will still be a forum to assess impacts on other faculties; - Who will decide whether reports that merit consideration with regards to the academic mission of the University will be bumped to APC; - Impact of decisions regarding academic programs on the collective agreement; - The balance of student membership and whether students would need to be members of GFC or could preferably be members of GFC; - Whether there was a need to clarify the role of Colleges in the Terms of Reference; 	<p>ToR approved: May 2020</p> <p>Review date: May 2023</p>	

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What would happen if a program proposal came from a college and not a faculty council and whether a proposal could come forward without a lead faculty; - That the Programs Committee may feel that support from faculties was reassuring and the example of the Peter Lougheed Leadership College which has raised considerable concerns because there was no lead faculty; <p><u>January 22, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members received a new draft of the Programs Committee Terms of Reference and provided initial feedback. They discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The definition of “establishment” and the absence of indications of authority to establish courses within the PC Terms of Reference; - The authority over course creation and deletion, where courses “live” in the <i>University Calendar</i>, and the relationship between courses and programs of study; - How to distinguish between the authority to establish programs and to set conditions and policies for program development and monitoring; - The definition of <i>University Calendar</i>; - A gap in the the draft with regards to minor program-specific regulation changes; - The definitions of “routine”, “significant” and “substantive” and the need to carefully define these terms; - The proposed definition of “credential” that aligns with the Ministry’s Alberta Credential Framework and which represents a change to how we have defined “credential” to present; - The risk of language requiring that proposals be routed to full GFC or the Board; - Whether changing the “home” faculty of a program should require approval by GFC; - The definition of “quota”; and <p>The limitation of authority with regards to Indigenous student regulation;</p> <p><u>October 23, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the authority of the Programs Committee and the advantage of aligning delegated authority held by the committee to the PSLA; and - Members considered the need to balance a desire to streamline program approvals with an appropriate engagement with GFC - 		

Meeting Date	ITEM	Link to Current ToR and Template	Notes	Approval and Review date	Approval and Consultation Pathway
Jan 24, Feb 7, 2022 <i>Winter 2024</i>	GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee (SCPC)	Current SCPC ToR SCPC Review Template	<p><u>February 5, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The committee discussed the possibility of moving the delegated authority from SCPC to the CLE Terms of Reference. <p><u>Jan 24, 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delegated authority must be in alignment across Board, GFC, and sections in the Codes and Practicum Intervention Policy etc. - Committee composition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for resource member from the RO because of responsibility regarding Code of Applicant Behaviour - Potential for Vice-Provost and Dean FGSR or designate - Consider membership across Colleges because of difference in conduct issues across disciplines - Concern that ratio of student members be maintained - ASC is disbanded so need to rethink the membership of an Associate Dean <p><u>Feb 7, 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members agreed that the Vice-Provost and Dean FGSR should be added to the composition and would replace the ASC cross-representative without changing the student ratio - Members discussed whether it was important to ensure that the composition was representative across disciplines because non-academic offenses and scholarly integrity were consistent across the university - Members agreed that this was ready to move forward to Exec once the delegated authority was aligned with the Board (BLRSEC updated ToR approved May 13/22) <p>Update: Changes to the Code of Student Behaviour related to the approval of the Student Conduct Policy (Fall 2022) and Academic Integrity Policy Suite (pending) will require changes to the SCPC ToR. Additional review and alignment will be undertaken once these changes have taken place.</p>	ToR approved: Oct 30, 2017 Review date: Oct 2020	Discussion: TBD Action: TBD
October 23, 2023 January 22, 2024	Composition of General Faculties Council	Current GFC ToR GFC Review Template	<p><u>February 5, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the importance of the student perspective on GFC and the need to balance the size of the body with efficiency. They noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examples of proposals where students have voted as a block; - That the students have a shorter lifecycle than academic staff; and - That discussion and debate have rarely been impaired by the student perspectives and that students moderate the perspectives of other stakeholder groups; 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members asked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether there was data on how students were voting; - How the student caucus may seek to support students and clarify their perspectives; - How students manage the substantial time commitment to serve on GFC; and - About the possibility of weighting student votes; - Concerning the balance of academic staff perspectives, members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The traditional balance of a majority of academic staff on academic senates; and - That administrators are perceived to have a power imbalance and a question about whether secret ballots would be more appropriate; <p><u>January 22, 2024</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members were informed about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statutory composition and the evolution in membership; - Principles approved in 1971 concerning student membership; - Comparator senate sizes; and - Past decisions concerning GFC Composition. <p><u>October 23, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members reviewed the past work to review GFC Composition and considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lack of consensus on how to move forward; - Updates on the history on appointments of librarians, consultations with the Vice-Provost (Equity, Diversity and Inclusivity) and the Vice-Provost (Indigenous Programs and Research); - Whether GFC should have seats for NASA, TRAS and Post-Graduate Medical Students - Members discussed the support for student membership, voting practices, and the work of the GPO to present; <p><u>Apr 4, 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential addition of the NASA and PDFA Presidents. <p><u>Nov 28, 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether ATS and other academic staff would be elected to serve on GFC in any numbers or if faculty would continue to fill those seats and whether the dedicated seats for these constituencies under appointed members of GFC should remain <p><u>Jan 23, 2023</u></p>		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They heard feedback from appointed members elected to represent academic teaching staff that even though ATS are now eligible to serve in the Statutory elected member seats, they should still have appointed representation; - Feedback from the AASUA that the APO/FSO seat should not need to be shared; - The size of the body and that the lack of efficiency in decision-making is not related to the number of members; and - The value of a diversity of perspectives and the need for members to see themselves in the body. <p><u>Feb 6, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the size of the constituent group should be proportional to their representation on GFC (i.e. librarians, NASA, MAPS, etc.) - That the numbers should be shared with everyone for their consideration - Whether positions such as the Vice-Provosts Indigenous Programming and Research, and Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion should be GFC members - Whether TRAS and TLAPS should have representation as well - Whether there were other student or staff groups that should be represented <p><u>Mar 27, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members asked for background information on the addition of 3 librarians to the composition <p><u>Apr 24, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The potential to add other leaders such as the VP EDI and Indigenous Programming and Research - Whether any of the appointed members should be made non-voting - Most members felt that it would be difficult to make someone non-voting and that GFC would need a clear rationale for that - So far perspectives heard have mostly been from academic staff which make sense because this is academic governance but the percentage of academic staff at the University overall is low - 20% - The history and the relationship with St Joseph's and St Stephen's - The NASA representation should be increased, some said to at least 5 members, because the group is so large - Whether there should be a principle/formula established such as a group with 100-1000 gets one seat and every additional 1000 means an additional seat to make a balance easier to determine - Whether the number of librarians should be reduced due to low numbers and the history and high engagement of that group on GFC, also that librarians 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<p>cannot stand for election to GFC as their appointments are not in the Faculties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medical Residents (PGME) have their own academic policy and procedure regarding grades and appeals, etc, and this is all under the authority of Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry and Alberta Health Services so not sure if they would want GFC representation. - Any consultation with respect to representation on GFC should include the expectation that reps speak on behalf of their groups so must report and consult with their constituents - That it is difficult to speak on behalf of a large and diverse group - Members were not ready to make a recommendation to EXEC and felt that this issue needed more discussion and consultation. 		
Apr 4, 2022	Council on Student Affairs (COSA)	Current COSA ToR COSA Review Template	<p><u>Apr 4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Composition - up to half the student members should be from at-large with preference to GFC members. - Addition of the Vice-Provost and Dean, FGSR. - The Vice-Chair should be either UASU or GSA President (to be chosen by SU and GSA each year). - COSA's role and opportunity to start conversations about student concerns. - NC's job to ensure broad representation. 	<p>ToR approved: February 2019</p> <p>Review date: February 2022</p>	<p>Exec Apr 11, 2022 (Recommended)</p> <p>GFC May 2, 2022 (Approved)</p>
Jan 24, Feb 7, 2022	GFC Nominating Committee (NC)	Current NC ToR NC Review Template	<p><u>Jan 24</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion to provide more emphasis on EDI <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consulting with Senior Advisor, Equity and Human Rights - Question about duties of the Chair to provide advice and reporting back to committee - General agreement that composition should be opened up a bit to encourage broader representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase number of recent members of GFC allowed - Allow for members of other categories - Some seats could be "preference to GFC members" <p><u>Feb 7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the committee composition including NC's objection to including at-large members. They determined that membership should be opened up to allow inclusion of elected GFC members from other staff categories as well as one at-large 	<p>ToR approved: April 2018</p> <p>Review date: April 2021</p>	<p>Discussion: Exec Apr 11, 2022 (GFC May 2, 2022 - deferred) GFC Oct 17, 2022</p> <p>EXEC Oct 31, 2022 (Recommended)</p> <p>GFC Jan 30, 2023 (Approved)</p>

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<p>academic staff member - noting concerns with workload and the importance of increasing a diversity of perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GPO coordinator noted that the updated tracked changes document would be circulated to members once the draft EDI statement for the mandate and role of the committee was ready 		
<p>Feb 7, Apr 4, Oct 24, Nov 28, 2022 Feb 6, Mar 27, 2023</p>	<p>GFC Executive Committee (Exec)</p>	<p>Current EXEC ToR EXEC Review Template</p>	<p><u>Feb 7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approval of Faculty Council quorum and composition - Control functions related to Faculty Councils and GFC authority in section 29 and 30 of the PSLA - Whether the Colleges would have Councils and where their authority comes from - Clarity around what special arrangements for student hearings would need to be made and whether that should stay with Exec or maybe be moved to SCPC - Where decisions related to consolidated exams, parchments, and the University Calendar belonged and the authority of the Registrar - Authority related to the approval of the draft GFC agenda including priority setting and timing - The GFC Secretary and GPO Coordinator committed to bringing back some information about consolidated exams and parchments as well as authority related to Faculty Councils and Student Judiciary Matters. <p><u>Apr 4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GFC Secretary and GPO Coordinator updated members on consultations with the Office of the Registrar and Governance Appeals Coordinator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Related to Calendar, parchments, Chancellor’s language at convocation, consolidated exams and section 25 of the GFC Policy Manual. - Related to annual reports coming to Exec for information rather than discussion and the potential need to approve and train new panel members quickly outside of the normal NC/GFC process. - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - College Deans and College Model and whether control functions would play a role. - Articulation of authority of GFC and Faculty Councils (FCs)- that it was awkward when FCs made decisions outside of their purview and the need for a refresher for all FCs. 	<p>ToR approved: February 2019</p> <p>Review date: February 2022</p>	<p>Discussion/Feedback: EXEC Jan 16, 2023 GFC Jan 2023 (feedback form) EXEC Feb 13, 2023 GFC Feb 27, 2023</p> <p>EXEC Apr 3, 2023 (Recommended)</p> <p>GFC Apr 17, 2023 (Approved)</p>

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity as to the line between governance and administration (FCs and Faculty Deans). - Whether Exec could request the ToR for all the FCs. - That Exec held the delegated authority from GFC to recommend on GFC and Committee governance procedural oversight and that Committees should be consulted but should not be expected to recommend on their own ToR. - Oversight and how committees fit into the larger governance picture is key. <p><u>Oct 24</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed how to engage with GFC on Exec and GFC ToR given that early consultation and discussion time at GFC meetings is limited. They agreed that circulating questions and a feedback form would be a good strategy and would allow GPO to hear from members of GFC who are not as vocal in the meetings. - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Composition</u> - general agreement that membership should be opened up to include members from more constituencies and that Dean should be specifically a Faculty Dean. - <u>Prepare GFC agenda</u> - whether there should be clarification about authority to ask for more work or consultation on <u>all items</u>, whether they come from GFC standing committees, university administration, or members of GFC, before placing them on the agenda. - <u>Faculty Councils</u> - whether the role of the Colleges needed to be taken into account here - FCs have statutory authority and GFC has related authority but that Colleges are more administrative and not under this role - “control functions” language and agreed to align with PSLA language for clarity - agreed that Chair should ask Exec to request FC ToRs for GPO to review - recognized GFC authority re approval of FC Composition but questioned GFC’s role to approve FC quorum. - <u>Student Judiciary matters</u> - agreed that language re policies should be more general and refer to PSLA language and that reports should come for information since they are discussed at GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee (SCPC). - <u>Academic Procedures</u> - Parchments, Registrar will bring information re rigorous rules on that - Consolidated exams and whether this could be delegated to the Registrar because it was administrative - heard that there could come a time when a decision needed to be made as to which courses needed consolidated exams and which did not and whether that authority 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<p>would be better placed at GFC Programs Committee (PC) with admin piece held by the Registrar - Felt that decisions re convocation did not need to be included in ToR because rare and could be routed to Exec or GFC as appropriate - Rescission of GFC Policy 25 and fleshing out subdelegation to Registrar regarding editorial changes to the <i>Calendar</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Governance Procedural Oversight</u> - whether this authority could be better articulated. - Members asked the GPO Coordinator and the GFC Secretary to create a tracked changes version of the Exec ToR that the subcommittee could work on at the November meeting and to prepare a feedback form for GFC. <p><u>Nov 28</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members went through the draft tracked changes document and suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the composition be only increased by two members - The composition include one member from another staff category to better align with the composition of GFC - That the additional staff member not be specifically a NASA member but that it be open to any of the 10 elected staff members in the appointed category - Revisions to the language in 4.2 to more clearly state Exec's responsibility for ensuring that materials that go to GFC are complete and ready but not to suggest "gatekeeping" authority that Exec does not hold related to notices of motion made under 8.7 in the meeting procedural rules - The authority of the Registrar and rescission of GFC Policy 25 - Members agreed that the draft tracked changes document was ready to go to Exec and GFC for their feedback <p><u>Feb 6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the feedback from GFC regarding whether there should be a dedicated NASA staff member on Exec. They observed that the NASA reps on GFC were eligible to put their name forward for GFC and discussed NC's role to ensure the broadest base of perspectives, diversity, and representation for the committees. <p><u>Mar 27</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members agreed that they were ready to send the ToR forward to EXEC. 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
March 27, 2023	GFC University Teaching Awards Committee (UTAC)	Current UTAC ToR UTAC Review Template	<p>December 2021 Update: The work of the University Teaching Awards Committee has been paused until further notice while the Provost examines the award processes from the perspective of Indigenous Initiatives and Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. The work is being led by Dr. John Nychka, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives).</p> <p><u>Mar 27</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed changes to the UAPPOL Awards for Excellence in Teaching Policy Suite in response to the recommendations of the Equity, Diversity & Inclusivity Review of Teaching Awards Working Group, and the implications for the GFC University Teaching Awards Committee - alignment with the updated policy (policy and procedure names, responsibility for adjudication guidelines, mandate, and role) - significant changes to the composition including more ATS staff and the addition of four appointed members: Vice-Provost (Indigenous Programming and Research), Vice-Provost (Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), and Executive Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning - whether adding additional members as needed to fill gaps was possible, and agreed that the Committee Chair should be responsible for that after consultation with UTAC members and the Nominating Committee Chair - Members expressed some concern with the tight timelines for these substantial changes but agreed to send the proposal forward to EXEC for their consideration. 	ToR approved: November 2018 Review date: November 2021	EXEC Apr 3, 2023 (Recommended) GFC Apr 17, 2023 (Approved)
Apr 4, Nov 28, 2022, Jan 23, Feb 6, Mar 27, Apr 24, 2023	General Faculties Council (GFC)	Current GFC ToR GFC Review Template Reapportionment Procedure Report of GFC Ad Hoc Review of Academic Restructuring	<p><u>Apr 4, 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FoMD's disproportionate number of statutory elected faculty seats. - The definition of "full time members of the academic staff" as set out in the PSLA. - The large number of student members is unique to the UofA. - The large size of GFC makes it difficult for members to engage. - Potential addition of the NASA and PDFA Presidents. - Opportunities to engage at the committee level. - GFC's interest in budget information and whether there was value in presenting budget information at GFC when it was regularly presented in open session at APC. 	ToR approved: April 2019 Review date: April 2022	Discussion: (Feedback) EXEC Feb 13, 2023 GFC Feb 27, 2023 EXEC Mar 13, 2023 <i>GFC Mar 20, 2023 (deferred)</i> EXEC Apr 3, 2023 <u>ToR - with no change to composition:</u>

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members acknowledged that this was a preliminary discussion only. The GFC Secretary and GPO Coordinator committed to providing more information around composition and apportionment as well as the subdelegations and responsibilities listed in the ToR. <p><u>Nov 28</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members were informed of the decisions that Executive had made over the years to limit the definition of full time academic staff and the current non-compliance with the PSLA insofar as GFC and Faculty Council Composition was concerned - Members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The changes that would result to GFC and Faculty Council Composition when this issue was resolved and “full time academic staff” was correctly interpreted to mean all academic staff under category A in the appendix to the UAPPOL recruitment policy - The large number of elected academic staff members from the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry - Whether term ATS were considered full time - The number of academic staff that do not belong to a Faculty and would thus not be eligible to stand for election to GFC - Whether ATS and other academic staff would be elected to serve on GFC in any numbers or if faculty would continue to fill those seats and whether the dedicated seats for these constituencies under appointed members of GFC should remain - Regarding the GFC terms of reference members suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That links to the GFC Guiding Documents be included in the Terms of Reference - That GFC Committee work and the budget responsibility should be highlighted - Whether the first meeting was appropriate for budget information - Removing subdelegation to approve Faculty specific requirements regarding physical testing and immunizations in 4.1 <p><u>Jan 23, 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding the Report of GFC Ad Hoc Review of Academic Restructuring, GPO members discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The value of the report and the timeliness of reviewing it at GPO, given the concerns expressed about collegial governance in the fall; 		<p>EXEC May 15, 2023 (Recommended)</p> <p>GFC May 29, 2023 (Approved)</p>

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The importance of governance education to ensure members understand their role; - The important work done in GFC standing committees and that members may not understand delegations of authority; - Recommendations 1 and 2 regarding GFC and its role, required understanding about GFC’s responsibility over academic affairs and that could be clarified in the terms of reference especially in the context of bicameral governance, and changes to section 1 of the GFC terms of reference; and - Recommendation 3 concerning the importance of establishing procedures for transmitting the will of GFC to the Board in the event that the chair of GFC disagrees with a recommendation of GFC and changes that could be made to section 8 of the GFC terms of reference. - Regarding the GFC Terms of Reference, GPO members focused on composition and discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The differences between statutory members (ex officio, elected members, and students) and appointed members (elected students, and other appointees including members serving by virtue of their role, representatives of staff categories, and Board of Governors representatives); - The 1971 decision to ensure parity between appointed students and elected academic staff; - A Notice of Motion put forward in February, 2022 and the decision not to approve it based on the need to holistically review the composition of GFC; - They heard feedback from appointed members elected to represent academic teaching staff that even though ATS are now eligible to serve in the Statutory elected member seats, they should still have appointed representation; - Feedback from the AASUA that the APO/FSO seat should not need to be shared; - The size of the body and that the lack of efficiency in decision-making is not related to the number of members; and - The value of a diversity of perspectives and the need for members to see themselves in the body. - Members asked for data about the different categories of staff and to have access to the 1971 decision for the next meeting. - There was no discussion on the Reapportionment Procedure. The item was deferred. <p><u>Feb 6</u></p>		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the tracked changes document that was drafted in response to the discussions at the previous meeting - Members agreed that organizing appointed members under headings added clarity - Members discussed links to the roles and responsibilities documents but asked about GFC's voice and the frustration of some members with respect to lack of information on some proposals. They considered what GFC's authority was to ask for more information when there is no standing committee involved and the items come straight to GFC - Members discussed composition including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the size of the constituent group should be proportional to their representation on GFC (i.e. librarians, NASA, MAPS, etc.) - That the numbers should be shared with everyone for their consideration - Whether positions such as the Vice-Provosts Indigenous Programming and Research, and Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion should be GFC members - Whether TRAS and TLAPS should have representation as well - Whether there were other student or staff groups that should be represented - Consultation with the UASU and GSA - That the 2017 adhoc recommended making GFC smaller but that would mean reducing elected student members and GFC did not choose to do that in response to the ad hoc recommendations - What a voting seat on GFC means for a group <p><u>Mar 27</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members approved of the changes made to the non-composition pieces of the ToR in response to feedback and agreed that they were ready to move forward along with the revised Reapportionment Procedure - Regarding composition, members discussed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the feedback received from GFC was very divided but much of it lacked a rationale - Whether the 1971 decision that no one group should be able to carry a vote without a substantial number of supporters from another group would be upheld - The pending notice of motion to add academic staff to the composition - The February 2022 notice of motion to add academic staff and students to the composition - Members asked for background information on the addition of 3 librarians to the composition 		

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Link to Current ToR and Template</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Approval and Review date</u>	<u>Approval and Consultation Pathway</u>
			<p><u>Apr 24</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed GFC Composition including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The potential to add other leaders such as the VP EDI and Indigenous Programming and Research - Whether any of the appointed members should be made non-voting - Most members felt that it would be difficult to make someone non-voting and that GFC would need a clear rationale for that - So far perspectives heard have mostly been from academic staff which make sense because this is academic governance but the percentage of academic staff at the University overall is low - 20% - The history and the relationship with St Joseph's and St Stephen's - The NASA representation should be increased, some said to at least 5 members, because the group is so large - Whether there should be a principle/formula established such as a group with 100-1000 gets one seat and every additional 1000 means an additional seat to make a balance easier to determine - Whether the number of librarians should be reduced due to low numbers and the history and high engagement of that group on GFC, also that librarians cannot stand for election to GFC as their appointments are not in the Faculties - Medical Residents (PGME) have their own academic policy and procedure regarding grades and appeals, etc, and this is all under the authority of Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry and Alberta Health Services so not sure if they would want GFC representation. - Any consultation with respect to representation on GFC should include the expectation that reps speak on behalf of their groups so must report and consult with their constituents - That it is difficult to speak on behalf of a large and diverse group - Members were not ready to make a recommendation to EXEC and felt that this issue needed more discussion and consultation.		