A meeting of Faculty Board was held on Friday, December 11, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in Kingston Hall Room 101. Mr. Ascough was in the Chair.

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**
   Moved by Ms. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, and carried that “the agenda be adopted.”

2. **Approval of the Minutes**
   Moved by Mr. Walker, seconded by Ms. Atkinson, and carried that “the minutes of November 13, 2015 be adopted.”

3. **Business Arising from the Minutes**
   There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. **Arts and Science Undergraduate Society Report**
   Mr. Jamieson wished the Board a Merry Christmas.

5. **Dean’s Report**
   The Faculty’s budget submission for next year, which is developed with departments in the Fall, goes to the Provost’s Advisory Committee on the Budget in early December. The Dean explained that this is relevant for Faculty Board as financial decisions made by the Committee have academic consequences and that the Faculty’s budget summary will be on the Faculty of Arts and Science website in two weeks. The Dean summarized the key elements of the budget: there is a projected deficit of $2.7 million in 2016-17 but by 2018-19 a surplus of $1.8 million is projected. The increased revenue is due to the increase in undergraduate enrollment as well as some new revenue generating programs including the expanded dual-degree program, the new internship option, a controlled increase in the number of international students, and increased fundraising.

   The Dean highlighted the successful capital campaign which is ongoing and noted that additional unspecified funds over the initial target is placed into the scholarship fund which has been expanded from Arts students to include Science students. The Dean added that additional funds will come from increased enrollment of upper-year transfer students into program that have capacity. Finally, as part of the budget, the Dean urged faculty members to have a look at the Faculty’s research plan to help ensure that it is congruent with the faculty’s interests.

   The full text of the Dean’s report is available at:

6. **Question Period**
   Mr. Chippendale asked what the academic criteria were for upper-year transfer students. Ms. Blake responded that the minimum is a 2.6 GPA from the transferring university and students must also meet the minimum standards for the plan, which is higher than 2.6 for several plans. Ms. Wallace asked that since transfers student only enter plans with capacity, would it not be the case that these plans are those that are more difficult. Both the Dean and Mr. Horton agreed that this does not seem to be the case at Queen’s where some of the more difficult programs are also the hardest to get into.

   Mr. Kawaja noted that in the Life Sciences and Biochemistry program about 20% of the their students leave Queen’s in 3rd year to go to professional schools, such as medicine, giving opportunities for upper-year transfers.
Mr. Rose asked if the Dean could inform the Board about the faculty research areas highlighted in the budget submission. The Dean responded that at this point, while there is not a definitive list, a few key areas have been identified where faculty are receiving significant funding and areas where CRC chairs and QNS scholar positions cluster. With that in mind, the Dean also noted that research areas must remain fluid and flexible and that the consulting process will continue and will be led by Mr. Horton and Ms. Jessup.

7. **Communications**
   There were no communications.

8. **Report of the Academic Orientation Committee** – Appendix A – for information
   Ms. Dickey asked why the report did not contain any details about the Rock Concert that takes place during orientation and wondered how that event was justified. Mr. Jamieson responded that the concert is organized the Orientation Round Table, a subsidiary of the AMS, and is not an academic event and so not included in the Academic Orientation Committee’s report.

9. **Curriculum Committee Omnibus Report** – Appendix B - for approval
   Moved by Ms. Stephenson, seconded by Mr. Moore, “that the Omnibus Report Part II be approved.” Mr. Chippindale commented that the proposed changes to the Department of Biomedical and Molecular Sciences (DBMS) program have consequences to the Department of Biology. The changes include the deletion of a biology course from the Life Science program and a deletion of BIOL 205 as a prerequisite to BCHM 218, which will lead to significant curriculum and budget issues. Mr. Chippindale hoped that the lessons learned in this process will lead to clear communication about curriculum change in the future and urged Life Sciences and Biochemistry to make their students aware of the consequences of not including these courses in their degree plan.

   Mr. Morelli commented that in light of the curricular and budgetary impact there was no rational in the document for these changes. Ms. Stephenson clarified that the submission from DBMS was reviewed by a subcommittee of faculty and students and then presented to the curriculum committee as a whole. The DBMS submission was reviewed at two full sessions.

   Mr. Rose seconded the concerns raised and felt that this was a consequence of the activity-based budget, which may be discouraging departments from having others teach their students. Speaking to the rationale for the decision, Mr. Kawaja noted the decision to alter the course plan was not made lightly and having recently gone through their cyclic program review, and having it approved, the Provost recommended that DBMS review their program and determine the optimal number of core courses to ensure degree plan requirements that are linked closely to the expected learning outcomes. The department agreed to do that and the plan was approved by Senate. He added, that the committee formed to put the recommendations in place recognized the value of all the core courses but second year students are required to take 18 (Life Sciences Major), 21 (Biochemistry) and 27 (Life Sciences Specialization) course units out of 30, leaving very little room for optional courses, which affected the student’s educational experience.

   Ms. Atkinson asked why BIOL 205 was selected rather than some other course.

   Mr. Kawaja responded that the courses considered to be dropped from the core will always be the course that is not as germane to the area of specialization and that DBMS students felt that BIOL 205 was the least relevant to their program. Ms. Medlock agreed that BIOL 205, while it was a good course, was not as applicable as other second year courses, especially in a very busy second year and that this was the best way to reduce the number of required courses.

   Mr. Chippindale noted that altering the requirements for these courses affected the sequence of courses in the degree plan and that these types of decisions can be seen as based on budget constraints.
Ms. Griffiths noted that not taking BIOL 205 limits upper year opportunities.

Ms. Stephenson responded that Life Science students are notified that BIOL 205 is the gateway course to upper year courses in biology and BIOL 205 is an option in their program.

Mr. Morelli, while respecting the committee process felt that Faculty Board should consider the decision itself and not just that approving a motion because the process was followed. He also said that he did not recall a motion by Senate to reduce the number of core courses for DBMS or any department and felt that 4-5 core courses a term was reasonable.

Mr. Horton said that there are very clear parameters on how many courses are required in our majors and degrees felt that the proposal was in line with both the letter and spirit of our faculty’s definition of a credit unit and a major plan.

Ms. Atkinson suggested that a clearer statement of how courses map onto program plans and expected learning outcomes would create a stronger rationale as to why certain courses are added or removed from a plan.

Ms. Stephenson acknowledged that indeed the decisions of the curriculum committee are not related to budget or staffing but are based on academic value to the students, and the decisions align with expected outcomes and the degree plan.

Mr. Ascough called the question. With one opposed and one abstention the motion passed.

10. **Collaborative Bachelor of Music Theatre Undergraduate Program Proposal – Appendix C – for approval**

    Moved by Ms. Stephenson, seconded by Mr. Smith and carried “that the Collaborative Bachelor of Music Theatre Undergraduate Program Proposal be approved.”

11. **Science Graduate Council Curriculum Submission Report – Appendix D – for information**

    The Science Graduate Council Curriculum Submission Report – November, 2015 was submitted for information. There were no questions on the report.

12. **Proposal from the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP) – for Discussion**

    Mr. Morelli presented a Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP) proposal on sessional dates that would include a proposal for a Fall term reading week. The proposal can be seen and comments can be left at: http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/senate/committees/academic-procedures-committee/sessional-dates-proposal

13. **Other Business**

    There was no other business
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