



Minutes

MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Wednesday, May 20, 2009 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 9:30 a.m.

Present: Senator Oosthuizen in the Chair **Senators:** Archibald, Baker, Boag, Brien, Brinkworth, Brock, Brown, Bruno-Jofre, Ceci, Christie, Deakin, Deane, Dixon, Flanagan, Hills, Horton, Jahanbakhsh, Kisilevsky, LaFleche, Leichner, MacLean, McCormack, McGrath, Minnes, Norman, Remenda, Rouget, Rowe, Ryan, Santeramo, Saunders, Staples, Stevens, Tam, Walker, J. Welsh, Whitney, Wiener, G. Moore (Secretary), P. Watkin (Associate Secretary)

Also Present: C. Beach, J-A. Brady, R. Coupland, S. Kemp, T. Lin, J. Medves, K. Montgoermy, K. O'Brien, H. Smith, C. Sumbler, B. Teatero, M. Whitehead.

Senator Oosthuizen expressed Principal Williams and Senator Stairs, Vice-Chair of Senate, regrets for not being present at Senate. Both were out of town on University business.

I OPENING SESSION

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Brien, that the Agenda be adopted as circulated.

Carried 09-35

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 23 April 2009 (Appendix A, page 1)

Moved by Senator Deakin, seconded by Senator Brien, that the Minutes of 23 April 2009 be adopted as circulated.

Carried 09-36

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no Business Arising from the Minutes.

4. Chair's Report

Financial Update

Senator Oosthuizen reported that the Board of Trustees approved the 2009-2010 budget at its meeting on May 2, 2009 but expressed serious concerns about carrying a deficit of \$8.3M. The Administration and the Board of Trustees' Finance Committee are scheduled to meet over the summer to discuss budget planning for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Additional information about the budget can be found on the Office of the Principal's website: <http://www.queensu.ca/principal/financialupdate/2009-10budgetreport.html>.

Installation Ceremony

Senator Oosthuizen reported that Dr. Daniel Woolf's installation ceremony is scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on Monday, October 26, 2009 in Grant Hall. Senators were encouraged to attend.

Spring Reunion and MiniU

Senator Oosthuizen noted that Spring Reunion and MiniU were scheduled for May 22-24, 2009. Over 700 alumni from 35 classes are expected to return to campus for Spring Reunion and plans for the second annual MiniU are going well.

Performing Arts Centre

Senator Oosthuizen reported that recent funding announcements would bring the University very close to the estimated \$65M needed to build the Isabel Bader Centre for the Performing Arts on the former Tett Centre site. The federal and provincial governments are contributing up to \$30M. Drs. Alfred and Isabel Bader have given \$18M and the City of Kingston has confirmed a funding contribution of \$6M.

5. Other Reports

a) **Research Report** (Appendix B, page 8)

Senator Rowe, Vice-Principal (Research), made the following announcements:

- Dr. J. Smol, Department of Biology, has won a Killam Prize and the Premier's Discovery Award for 2009;
- Dr. W. Kymlicka, Department of Philosophy as also won a Premier's Discovery Award for 2009;
- Dr. A. McDonald, Department of Physics, has been elected to the Fellowship of the Royal Society, the national academy of science of the UK and the Commonwealth.

b) **Board of Trustees Meeting, May 2, 2009** (Appendix C, page 16)

Senator Oosthuizen drew attention to the report on the Board of Trustees Meeting of May 2, 2009. There were no questions or comments.

c) **Presentation by Senator Deane, Vice-Principal (Academic) on "Contexts and Imperatives for Reviewing the Curriculum – A Discussion Paper"**

<http://www.queensu.ca/vpac/curriculumdiscussion.html>

Senator Deane, Vice-Principal (Academic) provided a PowerPoint (attached) presentation on his discussion paper entitled "Contexts and Imperatives for Reviewing the Curriculum". The following highlights were recorded:

- Although change is often difficult, Universities' intellectual growth is dependent upon their ability to periodically renew themselves;
- Change must be made within the framework of maintaining quality and resource realities;
- Changes to the curriculum must be rooted in a discourse that reflects the present state and trajectory of disciplines;
- External influences are global, national and provincial;
 - Globally, the Bologna accord, initiated in 1999, will influence higher education around the world. The accord began with members of the European Union and now consists of 44 signatures and affiliated observers including institutions from Africa, China and Australia. The original purpose of the accord was to maximize mobility for students between universities. It has now evolved to include quality assurance. One of the strengths of the accord is that it aligns post-secondary systems without eroding the local richness of individual institutions. AUCC has urged Canadian universities to take account of developments relating to the Bologna accord;
 - Provincially, there has been a shift to take an outcome based perspective on the curriculum. This is being achieved by applying UUDLES (University Undergraduate Degree-Level Expectations) and GDLES (Graduate Degree-Level Expectations) which were approved by Senate as part of Queen's Internal Academic Review process. A successful transformation to outcome based degree requirements will allow Ontario universities to participate in a system similar to the Bologna accord and enhance the mobility of its students;
 - Nationally, the Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC) has passed a document similar to UUDLES which will potentially aid Canada in participating in the emerging Bologna system;
- The two key imperatives going forward are academic currency and sustainability. Queen's needs to define what outcomes it is striving for and what resources are available to achieve those outcomes;

- By 2011 it is anticipated that a new quality assurance regime will be introduced by the Ontario government which will replace the current internal academic review process for both undergraduate and graduate level programs. The new process will encompass both undergraduate and graduate programs and is envisaged as self-regulatory. The new process will be organized by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAVP) and implicit in the new process will be an outcome based model of assessment.

Senator Deane stressed that it is unrealistic to think that the quality of a Queen's education can be preserved by tinkering with the curriculum. Failure to take note of academic currency will result in Queen's being marginalized. Senator Deane concluded his presentation by encouraging Senate to return to basic thinking, preserving essential values and remember that curriculum renewal is an open-ended process.

Senator Walker, Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences, thanked Senator Deane for his provocative paper which promotes more accountability to stakeholders. He noted that the University is challenged by its current structures which are not keeping pace with the evolving learning environment.

II QUESTION PERIOD (Appendix D, page 17)

1. From Senator Christie, QUFA President, requesting a written report of the Legal Counsel's opinion about the role of the Deans and Senate. Oral response to be provided by Principal Williams

On behalf of Principal Williams, Senator Oosthuizen responded that the Senate Minutes of April 23, 2009 (page 3), accurately reflected Legal Counsel's opinion about the bicameral governance model and the role of the Deans within that model. For this reason, Principal Williams will not be releasing a report on the legal opinion he obtained on this subject. Senator Christie confirmed that the response satisfied her concern.

2. From Senator Christie, QUFA President, regarding the Board of Trustees and changes to the governing structure of Queen's University. Oral response to be provided by Principal Williams

On behalf of Principal Williams, Senator Oosthuizen responded that the issue of a governance review was raised at the University Council Annual Meeting on May 1, 2009. It is anticipated that a review will be initiated this fall by the Principal and will include representation from the Senate, Board of Trustees, and the Council.

III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Academic Development (Appendix E, page 18)

a) Proposed change to degree name designation: Master of Applied Science in the Faculty of Applied Science.

Moved by Senator Deane

seconded by Senator Deakin

that Senate approve the change of degree name designation for the Master of Science (Engineering) (M.Sc. [Eng]) and the Master of Science (M.Sc.) to the Master of Applied Science (M.A.Sc.) in the School of Graduate Studies and Research. This change will take effect for all new students entering the program effective September 1, 2009, and for those students continuing in their program after September 30, 2009.

Carried 09-37

Senator Deane noted that the current distinction between the degree name designation for the Master of Science (Engineering) and the Master of Science exists for historical reasons. However, there is no meaningful purpose for this distinction and SCAD is recommending the adoption of a degree name designation of a Master of Applied Science (M.A.Sc.). There were no questions or comments.

- b) Proposal to introduce QBridge: Proposed Queen's University English Bridging Program
Moved by Senator Deane
seconded by Senator MacLean
that Senate approve the proposal to introduce QBridge, the Queen's University English
Bridging Program, to commence for students applying for admission in September 2010,
and to be reviewed after a three-year pilot.**

Carried 09-38

There were no questions or comments.

- c) Governing framework of the School of Graduate Studies
Moved by Senator Deane
seconded by Senator Deakin
that Senate rescind the Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies and Research,
Queen's University at Kingston established in 1971. Furthermore, SCAD recommends that
Senate endorse the Governing Framework for Graduate Studies, which describes the overall
shape and operations of the School of Graduate Studies as envisaged by the proposed and
approved changes to the governance structure.**

Carried 09-39

Senator Deane stated that at its February 26, 2009 meeting, Senate approved a new governance structure for the School of Graduate Studies and Research. The proposal before Senate was the operational framework based on the newly approved governance structure and if adopted would replace the existing Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies and Research.

Referring to the Governance Chart on page 50 of the Agenda, Senator Brien asked for clarification about the reporting structure of interdisciplinary programs. Senator Deane responded that the issue of interdisciplinary programs encompasses both undergraduate and graduate education and the University is still in transition regarding a reporting structure for these programs. Senator Deakin added that interdisciplinary programs were listed on the chart under the faculty councils where the majority of the lead academics involved in the programs are housed. Senator Brien reminded Senate that in February when the overall governance structure of the School of Graduate Studies was approved, the Vice-Principal (Academic) was asked to attend separately to the issues of the location of the School of Urban and Regional Planning and the School of Policy Studies and the responsibility, authority, accountability and resources for interdisciplinary graduate programs. Pending decisions about these issues, Senator Brien suggested a friendly amendment that asterisks * be added to the chart to indicate that there may be a change to the optimal home for interdisciplinary programs. The mover and seconder agreed with this amendment.

Senator Remenda asked that the Governance Chart on page 50 be further amended to reflect that the Department of Geological Sciences and Geological Engineering is part of the Applied Science Council as well as the Arts and Science Council.

Senator MacLean, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, noted that the proposed governing framework for the School of Graduate Studies places more responsibility on the individual faculties which will result in associated administrative costs for the faculties. Senator MacLean stated that it will take several months for the Faculty Board of Arts and Science to implement the proposed changes. Senator Deakin responded that the implementation date approved by Senate was July 1, 2009 but acknowledged that some faculties will be able to make the transition more quickly than others. In closing her remarks, Senator Deakin assured Senate that the School of Graduate Studies would ensure that the required work would be done during the transition period.

Senator J. Welsh asked if individual graduate student representatives from the faculty councils could have observer status on the Graduate Studies Executive Council. Senator Deane responded that he saw no reason to amend the proposal as the request was within the spirit of the document and reflected normal Senate procedures for accommodating official observers.

- d) **Motions from Senators Rouget and J. Welsh – Oral report from Senate Deane, Vice-principal (Academic) [Original referral can be found as Appendix N, page 143 of the April 23, 2009 Agenda: http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/senate/Apr23_09/Apr23_09.pdf**
Senator Deane reported on SCAD's deliberations regarding the Motions from Senators Rouget and J. Welsh which were referred to SCAD in April. The following guests participated in at least one of SCAD's meetings: Senator Rouget, Senator J. Welsh, D. Kelly (Legal Counsel), A. MacLean (Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science) and O. Nielsen (Chair, Arts and Science Faculty Board). Senator Deane noted that Dean MacLean's recent memo to the faculty-at-large in the Faculty of Arts and Science, which outlined a plan to address the concerns raised in the referred Motions, proved to be reassuring to Senator J. Welsh. The Dean's memo informed faculty that normal processes would be followed in the event of program closure. However, Senator Rouget continued to have concerns about jurisdiction and the relationship between the Board of Trustees and the Senate. Senator Deane reported that SCAD concluded that these concerns were outside of its mandate and recommends that they be considered as part of a larger governance review.

As Vice-Principal (Academic), Senator Deane confirmed that it was his responsibility to ensure that faculty board by-laws and due process are followed.

2. **Academic Development and Budget Review** (Appendix F, page 51)
- a) **Proposal to introduce a Collaborative Program in Biomedical Engineering in the School of Graduate Studies and Research**
Moved by Senator Deane
seconded by Senator Deakin
that Senate approve the establishment of the Collaborative Program in Biomedical Engineering in the School of Graduate Studies and Research, to commence in September 2009.

Carried 09-40

Senator Deane noted that an incorrect Program Approval Submission form was circulated with the Senate Agenda (Appendix F, pages 55-65). The correct version was handed out at the Senate meeting and posted on the Senate website. There were no questions or comments.

3. **Academic Procedures** (Appendix G, page 66)
- a) **Official Credit Unit Weighting and Grading at Queen's University**
Moved by Senator LaFleche
seconded by Senator Norman
that Queen's adopt a credit unit system that assigns weights in a scale where normally a 0.5 credit course translates to a weight of 3.0 credit units and a 1.0 credit course translates to a weight of 6.0 credit units, with provision for variation of assigned weights (e.g., 1.0 through 12.0) within the scale.

Carried 09-41

Dr. Charles Beach, Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP), spoke to the Motion and provided the following reasons behind the recommendation that Queen's University adopt a credit unit system that assigns weights in a scale of 1.0 to 12.0 credit units:

- A standard university-wide system will ease transfer of credits between faculties and programs across Queen's;
- The proposed scale allows for flexibility and decimal points to be applied. For example depending on the workload, a course could be weighted at 4.5;
- Aligning Queen's official transcript with the prevalent practices across North America will result in a student record that is easily understood by those outside of the University. Adopting this system will assist Queen's students when they are being assessed for admission into professional and graduate schools and/or for future employment;

- There is a global movement towards a scale of credit units including Europe, China, Australia and New Zealand;
- The implementation of the Queen's University Administrative Systems Replacement (QUASR) project has provided the unique opportunity to review, modernize and upgrade the official transcript so that it is consistent with the most prevalent practices in North America and Europe.

Dr. Beach reported that SCAP consulted widely while developing the proposal and input was sought from faculty boards, student societies, and the Office of the University Registrar.

In response to a question from Senator Whitney, J-A. Brady, University Registrar, confirmed that the "PeopleSoft" software will be able to utilize decimal points and that a rescaling exercise will take place within each of the Faculties.

**Moved by Senator LaFleche
seconded by Senator Deane
that Queen's adopt an official grading system of letter grades with Grade Point Average (GPA), as depicted in Appendix 1 of the report (attached). Faculties and Schools may choose not to assign all of the grades in the full scale which will be so noted in the legend of the official transcript. A top GPA of 4.0 will correspond to the highest achievable grade of A+, with the accompanying descriptor that A+ denotes exceptional academic achievement.**

Carried 09-42

Dr. Beach reported that following extensive deliberations and consultation SCAP is recommending that Queen's University adopt a letter grading with a grade point average (GPA) as the official grading system used on student transcripts. The proposal before Senate is similar to the system used at McMaster University and was chosen because it provides for the most refined granularity. Dr. Beach provided the following background information:

- Less than 5% of North American schools use a percentage grading system;
- Reporting of a GPA (Grade Point Average) is the norm in North America;
- Instructors will have the option of continuing to use percentage grading as the software will be able to convert the marks to letter grades and calculate the GPA for the official transcript.

Senator Walker, Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences, stated that in the School of Medicine, students are graded on a competency based evaluation system of Pass/Fail. Referring to Appendix Ga, page 69, Senator Walker stated it could be inferred that since an "F" is equivalent to a 0-49%, a pass could be achieved with a 50%. Senator Walker requested that the Minutes reflect that in the School of Medicine a passing grade in a competency based system cannot be achieved with a mark of 50%.

Senator Bruno-Jofre, Dean, Faculty of Education, noted that Education also uses a Pass/Fail grading system which is based on the uniqueness of the faculty and its transformative notion of education. The system is periodically reviewed, most recent occurring in 2008-2009.

On behalf of Senator Boyd, Commerce Society Senator, Senator Dixon read a statement which reported that on March 26, 2009, the Commerce Society endorsed a Motion in support of retaining percentage grading. The vote was adopted 51 to 1. Senator Boyd questioned the arguments that it would be beneficial to adopt a standard system across the University and that it would be a financial burden to retain a dual system of grading, i.e. percentage and letter grading. Senator Boyd expressed his dismay that the Motion to adopt a new grading system was brought to Senate in May when most Student Senators can not attend. He also asked if SCAP's decision to recommend a letter grading with a GPA was a unanimous decision of the Committee.

Dr. Beach responded that SCAP heard directly from the Commerce students and was aware of the particular concern that allotting an “A-” grade for marks between 80% - 84% would discourage students from working towards the higher range of the grade. However, in SCAP’s opinion, there is no evidence to support this argument. Dr. Beach noted that the majority of students outside of the Commerce program were in favour of the proposal. With regard to the suggestion of instituting a blended grading system, Dr. Beach confirmed that it would be very costly to the University and the expense would be incurred each time the system was upgraded. Dr. Beach confirmed that there was consensus amongst the members of SCAP to propose a grading system based on letter grades and GPA. J-A. Brady added that there is potential to work with the School of Business and the programmers to develop a reporting system based on percentage grades. However, the official transcript will record a letter grade with a GPA.

Senator Whitney reported that a number of concerns were raised at the Arts and Science Faculty Board and asked if solutions have been found to address these concerns. In particular, how will students be assessed for admission into, and progress through, competitive programs such as Life Sciences where there is a distinguishable difference between a 77% and a 78%? Secondly, how will students be assessed for the awarding of scholarships? J-A. Brady responded that solutions to these challenges will be the next step in the process. SCAP plans to deal with these issues in the Fall and will examine best practices at other universities before making any major decisions. Dr. Beach added that this is a very complex issue and that Senate was being asked to approve the major framework of the official grading system. Details on how to assess students using this system will be examined over the next academic year by SCAP, Faculty Boards and the AMS.

Senator Norman noted that in the Physical Therapy program over 600 applications are received each year for 66 places. For Queen’s students who are applying to enter either the M.D. or Rehabilitation programs, the Ontario Application Centre in Guelph, is already converting their percentage marks to GPAs. Senator Deakin added that the vast majority of graduate admission applications received by Queens have Grade Point Averages. To ensure that the strongest candidates are admitted supplementary information such as examples of writing and publication records, is used in addition to the GPA to rank potential students for both fellowships and admission.

Senator Remenda expressed her concern that technology appeared to be driving the proposed changes. She noted that the GPA system does not provide the fine granulation that a percentage grade system offers and suggested that the lack of distinction between an 85% and a 95% in the GPA system would be problematic when students are being considered for admission and scholarship. Dr. Beach agreed that the GPA system does not distinguish between an 85% and a 95% but the letter grade system with the addition of plus and minus will.

Senator Minnes noted that grades are often inflated and suggested that the descriptors relating to each letter grade are the most important indicator of a student’s accomplishments. She asked if the descriptors were consistent across institutions. Dr. Beach replied that SCAP did pay particular attention to the descriptors and modeled Queen’s on McMaster’s and Princeton’s characteristics.

Senator Wiener asked if the entire university would be transitioned at once or if certain students will be grandfathered. J-A. Brady responded that there are two feasible options. The first is to convert historical grades and the second is to convert historical weighting but leave historical grades and add a GPA. The system would have the capability to flash freeze history so that, during the transition period, a student’s transcript could display percentage grades obtained before the new system is implemented and letter grades after the new system is implemented. The graduating GPA for these students will be based on both their percentage grades and their letter grades. J-A. Brady noted that SCAP would be considering this issue further in the Fall. In response to a follow-up question from Senator Wiener, J-A. Brady confirmed that there can only be one official grading scheme and that the new system cannot accommodate a blend of percentage and letter grades. Based on the practices of the vast majority of universities around the world, SCAP is recommending a letter grade with a GPA.

In response to a question from Senator Brinkworth, J-A. Brady stated that it would be an option for faculties to record student marks in percentages. However, for the official transcript, these percentages would be converted to letter grading. J-A. Brady added that Dr. J. Mighty, Director of the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), supported the recommendation and offered the resources of the CTL to instructors who were interested in learning new assessment techniques.

Dr. Beach reiterated that SCAP and the University Registrar had consulted widely before making its decisions and stated that some opposition to the proposal is to be expected. He acknowledged that Queen's will have to rethink how it assesses its current and future students but with the aid of best practices from other institutions and some creative thinking within the university, Dr. Beach expressed his confidence that the proposed recommendations would serve Queen's well both today and into the future. In response to a question about the technology adopted by the QUASR project, Dr. Beach stated that in today's world it is no longer sustainable for institutions to develop their own computer programs but rather the most cost-effective, efficient and effective practice is to modify existing software developed by reputable software companies. Dr. Beach asked that when making its decision, Senate consider what structure would serve its students best in a world that is moving towards a standard system of recording grades.

Reflecting on the number of concerns and questions raised about the recommendation to adopt letter grading with GPA and the desire from some stakeholders to retain percentages, Senator Brien suggested that the Motion be tabled until the Fall for further deliberation. The Motion to Table was seconded by Senator Wiener and upon vote was defeated, 8 votes in favour, 20 against.

Senator Wiener suggested that percentages and GPA be instituted as the official grading system and requested an amendment to the main Motion. Dr. Beach cautioned that there may be a cost associated with adopting Senator Wiener's suggestion. Senator Oosthuizen ruled that Senator Wiener's suggestion could not be accepted as an amendment as it varied substantially from the original Motion of an official grading system based on letter grades and GPA. The mover of the original Motion, Senator LaFleche, agreed with this ruling. Senator Oosthuizen stated that he would entertain a new Motion from Senator Wiener if the main Motion failed.

On vote, the Motion to adopt an official grading system of letter grades with Grade Point Average (GPA,) carried: 20 in favour, 10 opposed, 4 abstentions. Senator Wiener asked that his vote opposing the Motion be recorded in the Minutes.

b) Reading Week 2010

Senator Oosthuizen drew attention to the correspondence regarding the decision that Reading Week in 2010 remain as previously scheduled, from February 22 to 26. There were no questions or comments.

c) Syllabus Bank

Senator Oosthuizen drew attention to the correspondence regarding the establishment of an Alma Mater Society (AMS) Syllabus Bank. Dr. Beach noted that some form of the AMS proposal has been adopted by all of the relative faculty boards. There were no questions or comments.

4. Agenda (Appendix H, page 72)

a) Amendment to 2009-2010 Meeting Dates

**Moved by Senator LaFleche
seconded by Senator Horton**

that the amended Senate meeting dates for 2009-2010 be approved.

Carried 09-43

5. Budget Review (Appendix I, page 73)

a) Annual Report 2008-2009

Senator Oosthuizen drew attention to the annual report of the Senate Budget Review Committee. There were no questions or comments.

6. Library (Appendix J, page 76)

a) Annual Report

Senator Oosthuizen drew attention to the annual report of the Senate Library Committee. There were no questions or comments.

7. Nominating (Appendix K, page 80)

a) Election

Moved by Senator Dixon

seconded by Senator Brown

that the student named in Appendix K, page 80, be elected to the Committee indicated.

Carried 09-44

There were no nominations from the floor.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES

None Received

V MOTIONS

None Received

VI COMMUNICATIONS (Appendix L, page 81)

1. New Senators 2009-2010

Senator Oosthuizen drew attention to the list of new Senators for 2009-2010 which was provided for information.

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEE (Appendix M, page 81)

Senator Oosthuizen drew attention to the following matter referred to the Senate Advisory Research Committee:

1. Proposed Amendments to the Centre for Neuroscience Studies Constitution [Referred to the Senate Advisory Research Committee (SARC)]

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

On behalf of Senate, Senator Deane, Vice-Principal (Academic), delivered the following tribute to Principal Williams:

Senators should be aware that this was to have been the last senate meeting for Principal Tom Williams, who is presently out of town on a matter that will bring considerable long-term benefit to the University. That this is so is further evidence of the Principal's commitment to this institution, a commitment which has been unstinting during an association of more than thirty years.

Many will have heard his entertaining account of the circumstances in which he received the invitation last year to serve Queen's as Principal, and all will acknowledge the clarity of purpose and resolve with which he has sought to address our institutional challenges in the intervening months. For this he deserves the gratitude of us all.

I would note, specifically, Principal Williams' commitment to the Senate and his various initiatives which have sought to reaffirm the importance of Senate in the decision-making processes of the University. His various financial updates, presented immediately before Senate meetings on a number of occasions, have underlined the key role of senators in working for the overall health and strength of the institution.

For these and many other reasons, widely known and acknowledged, please join me in expressing our gratitude to Tom Williams.

Senate expressed its gratitude to Principal Williams with a round of applause.

**Contexts and Imperatives for
Renewing the Curriculum**
A Discussion Paper

Patrick Deane
Vice-Principal (Academic)

*Meeting of the Senate
Queen's University
20 May 2009*

Queen's University
Queens

- Curriculum review and renewal is part of the process of change
 - To maintain quality and academic currency
 - To address resource realities

Queen's University
Queens

1. Global
 - The Bologna Process
2. Provincial
 - University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UUDLES)
3. Local
 - Financial challenges

Queen's University
Queens

- Academic Currency
- Sustainability

Queen's University
Queens

Background information and responses to the discussion paper can be found at www.queensu.ca/vpac/curriculumdiscussion

n

Senate Committee on Academic Procedures
Report to Senate – May 20, 2009

**OFFICIAL CREDIT UNIT WEIGHTING AND GRADING
AT QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY**

Proposed Official Grading System

	Letter Grade	Grade Point Value	Percentage (%)	Descriptor
Queen's	A+	4.0	90-100	Exceptional; significantly exceeds the highest expectations for course work.
	A	4.0	85-89	Outstanding; meets the highest standards for the assignment course.
	A-	3.7	80-84	Excellent; meets very high standards for the assignment or course.
	B+	3.3	77-79	Very good; meets high standards for the assignment or course.
	B	3.0	73-76	Good; meets most standards for the assignment or course.
	B-	2.7	70-72	More than adequate; shows some reasonable command of material.
	C+	2.3	67-69	Acceptable; meets basic standards for the assignment or course.
	C	2.0	63-66	Acceptable; meets some of the basic standards for the assignment or course.
	C-	1.7	60-62	Acceptable; while falling short of meeting basic standards in several ways.
	D+	1.3	57-59	Minimally acceptable.
	D	1.0	53-56	Minimally acceptable; passing grade.
	D-	0.7	50-52	Minimally acceptable; lowest passing grade.
	F	0.0	0 -49	Failure
	P			Pass; no grade assigned
H			Pass with honours; meets the highest standards for the assignment or course.	
AUD			Audit	
TR			Transfer Credit; no grade assigned	