



## Minutes

---

### MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Tuesday March 27, 2012 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

---

**Present:** D. Woolf (Chair) **Senators:** Abdollah, Adams, Basser, Beach, Blennerhassett, Bowers, Brouwer, Burford-Grinnell, Campbell, Chapman, Cole, Crowell, Culham, DeSouza, Detomasi, Dickey Young, Dimitrakopoulos, Dimitrov, El-Rahimy, Elliott, Fachinger, Flanagan, Foo, Harrison, Johnson, Hillman, Johnson, Jones, LaFleche, Liss, MacLean, Maurice, McCormack, McIntire, Medves, D. Moore, Morelli, Newcomb, Notash, Oosthuizen, Parker, Sienna, Sullivan, Tierney, Walters, Wang, Woodhouse, Yang, Young, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

**By teleconference:** R. Reznick

**Also present:** T. Alm, A. Bains, J. Brady, T. Bridges, C. Christie, R. Coupland, C. Davis, M. Dineen, I. Duchaine, S. Dunn, L. Faught, N. Francis, B. King, G. Lessard, L. Long, G. MacAllister, R. Marchildon, K. O'Brien, J. Parlow, L. Peterson, B. Ravenscroft, S. Rigden, M. Scribner, K. Sears, E. Singh, H. Smith, A. Sproat, S. Stylianou, C. Sumbler, B. Teatero, N. Tsui, E. VanDenKerkhof, K. Wallace, C. Wang, A. Warner, P. Watkin, T. Wheeler, J. Whittaker, R. Wilson, B. Yang

## I OPENING SESSION

The Principal welcomed attendees and congratulated the students who were successful in recent elections.

### 1. Adoption of Agenda

**Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Young, that the agenda be approved as circulated with the provision that the items under III Reports of Committees be considered in alphabetical order.**

**Carried 12-20**

Senator Fachinger withdrew a request to amend the agenda to include a motion related to the Queen's National Scholars program after the Principal clarified that:

- He had asked the Provost to work with the VP (Research) to review the program's terms of reference; and
- A decision on the new selection process has not yet been made.

### 2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 28 February 2012 (Appendix A, page 1)

**Moved by Senator Beach, seconded by Senator Culham, that the minutes be adopted as circulated.**

Senator Fachinger and Senator Jones both expressed concern about omissions of their comments and observations from the Minutes of February 27. Senator Jones commented in some detail on the shortcomings of the Senate minutes which, in his view, were not free of bias and consistent in coverage of all matters in the meeting.

The Chair noted that requests for corrections appeared to be occurring regularly; however it was not useful to spend 20 minutes at every meeting to deal with corrections to the minutes. He suggested

tabling approval of the February 28 minutes until the April 17 meeting. He asked Senators Jones and Fachinger to resubmit their suggested changes to the Secretary. He also referred the question of what corrections are made to the minutes and how this should be done to the Senate Operations Review Committee for review.

University Secretary G. Moore stated that the Secretary creates a record for perpetuity. In her view, it was not useful to include political or ideological convictions on the part of certain senators, or each and every senator's comment or question, in the official record of the Senate.

**Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Campbell, to table approval of the February 28, 2012 minutes to the April 17, 2012 Senate meeting, pending further consideration.**

**Carried 12-21**

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes**

The Principal noted that follow-up information on the Grade Point Average system and public budget consultation would be included in the Provost's report.

**4. Principal's Report (Appendix B, page 11)**

The Principal reported on several items including:

- Global competition for post-secondary education; Queen's must continue efforts to raise its international profile
- Research and academic partnerships
- A recent visit to the Bader International Study Centre in East Sussex, UK
- Provincial and federal budget announcements later in the week and potential impacts on post-secondary funding. Slightly less than 50 per cent of the University's funding comes from the Ontario government, down from 75 per cent in the early 1990s
- A planned visit to Queen's by the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Glenn Murray, in mid-May
- Impending release of a short position paper by the Principal; a sequel to his January 2010 paper, "Where Next?"

The Principal concluded his report by announcing the outcome of the motion approved by Senate on February 28, seeking legal advice on the scope of Senate's authority and its role in academic decisions. At the time, the Principal informed Senate that, while it does not have the authority to direct the Principal to seek legal advice or to assume the costs, he would present Senate's wishes to the Board of Trustees on March 2. He reported that, in response, the Board approved the request and authorized him to proceed. He was pleased to announce to Senate that Mr. Justice Frank Iacobucci had agreed to take on the task. In the Principal's view, Mr. Justice Iacobucci is well-placed to provide an opinion, given his experience in private practice, academia, government and the judiciary. He is currently Chair of the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario. Mr. Justice Iacobucci will be provided with:

1. The February 28 Senate motion
2. The pertinent writings on these issues by David Mullan and Diane Kelly
3. Details on the circumstances leading to the suspension of first-year admissions to the Bachelor of Fine Art program in 2011 and of small concentrations in the Faculty of Arts and Science in 2009
4. Any other materials Mr. Justice Iacobucci considers to be pertinent.

Mr. Justice Iacobucci will be asked to provide advice on the relative delimitation of the powers and responsibilities of Senate, the Board of Trustees and the senior officers of the University, namely the Principal, the Provost and the Deans.

In response to a question from Senator Jones asking if Ms. Kelly's opinion is publicly available, the Principal explained that it was a specific request on his part for legal advice from the University Counsel; therefore it is privileged information and will remain confidential.

## 5. Provost's Report

The Provost reported on:

- His recent visit to the Bader International Study Centre to attend its Board meeting
- Accommodation of graduate students with disabilities; the policy statement is posted on the School of Graduate Studies website
- In response to some community concerns regarding Continuing and Distance Studies (CDS), the Provost reminded Senate that Queen's has had a long history in the field, helping to broaden access to those unable to come to Kingston to take courses. More recently, the focus of CDS has extended to support blended learning strategies
- An update on concerns about the cumulative grade point average (CGPA) and the new student transcripts, as a follow-up to the SCAP report presented to Senate on February 28
  - The relevant Deans/Vice-Deans (Engineering and Applied Science, Queen's School of Business, and Nursing) have agreed to suggest to their respective Faculty boards that they will use the Arts and Science model for the cut-off for Dean's Honour List. This would set the cut-off at 3.5 (slightly lower than the previous cut-off of 80 per cent). Provisions for cut-offs for special distinction above the cut-off for Dean's Honour List are also being discussed, though not necessarily common across all programs. This will serve to ensure that roughly the same proportion of students will be on the Dean's Honour Lists as were previously. Additionally, the Provost will also ask the Senate Committee on Scholarships and Student Aid to consider the suggestion that the cut-off for renewable scholarships should also be 3.5 across all relevant programs
  - The second issue relating to adding percentage grades to the transcript is more complicated. The Provost noted that he began from the premise that the CPGA will continue to be used as the summary measure of a student's academic performance. Thus, the question is whether including percentage grades on the transcript, when they are available, provides additional useful information. In other words, does the omission of individual percentage grades disadvantage students, for example, when they apply for admission to graduate school? If so, the benefit from including percentage grades needs to be weighed against the costs of doing so. Preliminary indications are that the cost is lower than if the result of a calculation based on these additional grades were included. The Provost said he would consult the McGill University Registrar regarding that university's practices, since it had been suggested that McGill does include individual percentage grades. He noted that this may enable him to make a more informed judgment in the near future
- Financial update posted on March 26 <http://www.queensu.ca/financialupdate/index.html>. Regarding the 2011-12 budget ending April 30, the deficit is now forecast to be smaller than originally projected, in large part to the pension changes accepted by employee groups which have helped to address the pension plan solvency issue. A balanced budget for 2012-13 will be provided to the Board of Trustees for approval at its meeting on May 4. The Provost also announced a plan for a presentation to the University community on the new budget model immediately preceding the April 17 Senate meeting.

## 6. Other Reports requested by Senate

None

## II QUESTION PERIOD

## III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

### 1. Academic Development (Appendix E, page 43)

- a) Proposal to introduce a Master of Science in Healthcare Quality in the School of Nursing and the Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences and the School of Graduate Studies

*Supplementary documents containing CVs of those involved in the proposed program provided on the secure site, QShare (401 pages)*

**Moved by Senator Cole, seconded by Senator Medves, that Senate approve the introduction of a Master of Science in Healthcare Quality in the School of Nursing and the Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine (Faculty of Health Sciences) and the School of Graduate Studies, to commence September 2012, pending approval by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Quality Council.**

**Carried 12-22**

Four abstained.

SCAD Chair Senator Cole noted that the proposal was approved unanimously by SCAD and is the first degree proposal to go to the new Quality Council for approval.

Senator Brouwer, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, described the thorough site visit by two reviewers over two days. She said that the design, scope and timeliness of the program should garner wide appeal among students. In answer to a question about the external reviewers' report, Senator Brouwer replied that the report is confidential as were previous similar review reports under the former Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) program approval process.

Senator Jones and Senator Morelli raised several concerns, including:

- A potential lack of course demand
- A lack of time for Senators to adequately consider the proposal in advance of Senate
- Unclear information about the review process.

Senator Jones urged senators to vote no on the approval until additional information was provided.

The Chair noted that Senate does not operate as a committee of the whole to examine degree proposals. The standing committee structure of Senate exists for this purpose. The Senate Committee on Academic Development is charged by the Senate to evaluate the program and bring a recommendation to the Senate.

Senator Jones raised concerns about revenue generation. The Chair observed that every academic program offered is intended to generate revenue.

Senator Cole also clarified that the proposal was brought forward by the Faculty of Health Sciences and not the administration. She reported that the Faculty of Health Sciences and the School of Graduate Studies with contributions from several disciplines had developed the proposal. She went on to emphasize that duly elected SCAD members work extremely hard to examine such proposals, assisted by helpful input from the committee's guests and observers.

Senator Reznick assured Senate that the Faculty of Health Sciences had taken into account risk management issues. With regard to distance learning, he said it is important to focus on the learners, who are responsible for the oversight of patient safety in their institutions. The audience, which includes physicians, nurses and health care providers, require need-specific training and skills and would benefit from distance learning. The Faculty has an established reputation offering distance courses in medical education combined with onsite workshops.

In answer to a question from Senator Notash, Senator Medves noted that the course would be available to a wide range of people and that linking health care quality, risk and safety is a new discipline. Having lawyers involved in teaching the program will be a strength.

b) Subcommittee to consider procedures for the suspension of Admissions to Academic Programs

In response to concerns voiced by Senator Morelli about bias in the striking of a subcommittee and its membership, Senator Cole responded that the current SCAD membership was asked to volunteer to serve on a smaller subcommittee that would be able to work more nimbly and meet more frequently than SCAD. Given its size, it was important to include a representative from the Faculty of Arts and Science. Associate Dean Horton was asked to join the subcommittee to provide this coverage. The subcommittee has met once and its next meeting is March 28. The subcommittee will bring suggestions and recommendations to SCAD where there will be more discussion.

2. **Agenda** (Appendix C, page 13)

a) Senate meeting dates 2012-2013

**Moved by Senator Crowell, seconded by Senator Sullivan, that Senate approve the 2012-2013 meeting dates listed in the report in Appendix C, page 13.**

**Carried 12-23**

Senator Johnson observed that most students are not present for May meetings. He asked if it would be possible for SORC to look at the meeting schedule in the future and suggest options.

The Chair agreed.

3. **Educational Equity** (Appendix D, page 14)

a) Response from SEEC to the 2011 referral from the USAB

**Moved by Senator Notash, seconded by Senator Campbell, that every individual in the position to make a decision on student appeals have training on educational equity and human rights matters.**

In response to a concern by Senator Morelli about a need for more detail in the motion, Senator Notash, Chair of SEEC, explained that the Equity Office would be responsible for coordinating the training and determining the level required. Senator Notash and Senator Campbell accepted a friendly amendment to the motion which reads as follows:

**That every individual in the position to make a decision on student appeals have training on educational equity and human rights matters to a level to be determined by the Equity Office.**

**Carried 12-24**

**4. Operations Review** (Appendix F, page 118)

a) Response to Senate referral

Senator Culham noted that the request to add a member to the Senate was one of several that SORC would be considering when it reviews the composition of the Senate in the coming months.

**IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES**

None received.

**V MOTIONS**

**VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE**

The Chair drew attention to following matters provided to the Senate for information.

1. Board of Trustees meeting March 2-3, 2012 (Appendix G, page 119)
2. Research Report (Appendix H, page 121)
3. Safe Disclosure reporting and Investigation – Annual Report for 2010-2011 (Appendix I, page 126)
4. Online petition to Lift Queen's BFA Suspension (Appendix J, page 127)
5. Online petition concerning admission freezes and closures (Appendix K, page 128)

**VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES**

None received.

**VIII OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**IX CLOSED SESSION**

Not required.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:39 p.m.