A meeting of Faculty Board was held on Friday, May 1, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies Building Room 101. Mr. Ascough was in the Chair.

Before beginning the business of the meeting a tribute to Dr. James Pritchard was read. Dr. Pritchard was a Professor Emeritus in the Department of History at Queen’s, he passed away April 14th, 2015.

1. Adoption of the Agenda
   Moved by Mr. Jamieson, seconded by Mr. Walker that “the agenda be adopted”. Moved by Mr. Morelli, seconded by Ms. Fachinger that ‘Item 9  REVISED - Academic Writing Certificate Proposal be moved to after item 13”. The motion did not pass and the agenda was adopted.

2. Approval of the Minutes
   Moved by Mr. Morelli, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, and carried that “the minutes of April 10, 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, the incoming ASUS president introduced himself as did Mr. DiCapua (incoming Vice-President). Mr. Hafazalla, the incoming Academic Commissioner, had prior commitments and was not able to attend Faculty Board. Mr. Jamieson acknowledged the excellent work done by the outgoing executive and relayed that the past 2 months the incoming executive has been working on transitioning into their new positions. Mr. Jamieson said that the executive is looking forward to working with the members of Faculty Board and for those interested he can be contacted at president@ASUS.Queensu.ca and Mr. DiCapua can be reached at VP@ASUS.Queensu.ca.

5. Dean’s Report
   There was no verbal summary of the Dean’s report. The full text of the Dean’s report is available at http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/staff-and-faculty/faculty-board/2014-2015

6. Question Period
   There were no questions.

7. Communications
   There were no communications.

8. Faculty of Arts and Science - Faculty Senator Seats
   Ms. Lynda Colgan, Chair of the Senate Governance and Nominating Committee, and Mr. Eric Rapos, Chair of the Student Senate Caucus reporting on the following:
   
   - The Senate Governance and Nominating Committee (SGNC) is one of Senate’s standing committees, with responsibility for advising Senate on the effectiveness of governance structures, composition, and membership, among other items.
   - Over the past few years, SGNC has been working its way through a review of Senate and Senate’s standing committees, and the final stage has been reviewing Senate’s composition.
   - A motion on this topic (faculty seats allocated based on enrolment, how to measure enrolment, etc.) was passed by Senate in 2003, but never acted upon.
SGNC has spent all of 2014 attempting to develop a proposal based on the 2003 motion, but the proposed model was met with some resistance at Senate, particularly with respect to how faculty seats were apportioned.

SGNC reviewed the feedback, attempted to develop several different solutions, and has now recognized that a proposal which both adheres to the 2003 motion and satisfies all Senators’ concerns is not possible.

However, there is the option of a model that retains Senate’s current composition except for one very specific change – the creation of faculty-at-large seats to enable direct paths to Senate for all faculty, including librarians and archivists.

These seats cannot be newly created, since Senate needs to stay at 68 seats.

The Faculty of Arts and Science (ASC) has the largest number of faculty seats by far – 15, compared to the next closest, which is Engineering with 6.

The model discussed at Senate this year proposed a decrease to 12 faculty seats for ASC, and this particular change was not objected to.

We would like to propose that ASC’s faculty seat count decline to 13, so that two seats can be made into faculty-at-large seats.

ASC faculty will still be eligible for these seats via an election run by the Secretariat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Group</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Ex Officio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cur</td>
<td>Prop</td>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>Cur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng &amp; App Sci</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Total: 68
Proposed Total: 68
Change: 0

Moved by Mr. Ableson, seconded by Ms. King, “that the revised Academic Writing Certificate Proposal be approved.”

Speaking to the motion Ms. Ravenscroft noted that this is a revised version of a proposal that Faculty Board had already seen. Faculty Board approved the original proposal as did the Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD) but in Senate the motion to implement the program was defeated by one vote. The main objection to the proposal was that writing is already integrated into the undergraduate degree program and that a separate certificate was not needed. However, to better serve distance students who are not in a degree program the Academic Writing Certificate program was changed so that it would only be available to distance students and not to on-campus undergraduate career students. Consultation with the outgoing ASUS president and a group of Department Student Council (DSC) representatives was positive and the Curriculum Committee had no concerns with the change.

From the discussion of the original proposal Ms. MacDonald recalled that the main objection from students was that they did want the certificate program and felt that they should be able to use their degree courses to count toward the courses required for the certificate – which the original proposal rejected. She also noted that there are certificate programs where all or some of their degree courses can be counted towards a certificate. Ms. MacDonald felt that more student representatives should be present for the discussion and asked for comments from those students present.
Mr. Jamieson agreed with Ms. MacDonald that the concern for students was the double-counting of credits toward the Writing Certificate but was comfortable with the consultation with Administration and happy to see the modified proposal moving forward. He noted that it was necessary to balance the interests of the visible on-campus students with the interests of the invisible off-campus students. Finally, he added that future work might see a comparable certificate for on-campus students.

Mr. Parker asked if there are existing or proposed certificate programs that are delivered mainly by adjuncts and term adjuncts.

Dean Mumm addressed Ms. MacDonald’s comments agreeing with Mr. Jamieson that the distance students do not have the advantages of the on-campus students and that this certificate filled an academic need for distance students. The change to cater to a small group of distance students suggested developing the certificate was not driven by monetary concerns. As to the staffing of certificate programs, Dean Mumm said that Arts & Science current staffing profile for certificate programs is not unlike that in other faculties and that the staffing profile changes over time and often reflects who is available.

Ms. Lord asked why double counting courses towards this writing certificate for on-campus students was not part of the proposal. Mr. Horton replied noting that there are three Senate approved fully shared (for which courses can be double counted) certificate programs which have been in place for many years. He continued, that since that time there have been two new Senate policies on certificate programs and regulation changes, including policies passed by Faculty Board, that focus on the academic integrity of the certificate programs. The view, shared by many, is that a degree or certificate must include something extra. Likening a certificate to a dual-degree, there must be additional work done to meet the requirements of a dual degree, or in this case a certificate in addition to a degree.

Mr. Morelli moved, seconded by Ms. Fachinger, that “the proposal be modified so that the Proposed Start Date be January 2016”. Speaking to the amendment Mr. Morelli suggested that the Proposal is not substantially different from that already defeated by Senate and that Senate would not hear this motion a second time. In addition, the Proposal would not be on the agenda for the next Senate meeting (May 26, 2015) and since it may not be able to be approved by Senate that the Proposed Start Date be set to a more practical date.

Mr. Walker commented that altering the start date should be left to Senate and felt that the Proposal is different from that originally proposed. He felt no argument had been advanced to deny distance students from the proposed certificate program.

Several additional comments were made and it was agreed that the start date was a Senate matter and the Faculty Board should concern itself with the matter at hand.

Mr. Ascough called the question and the motion to amend the start date was defeated.

Returning to the main motion Mr. Morelli asked who was excluded from taking the on-line courses that comprise the Writing Certificate.

Ms. Ravenscroft clarified that students register in either an Undergraduate Career or a Distance Career. Undergraduate Career student have full access to on-campus courses as well as online courses. Distance Career students can only access online courses. The Writing Certificate is only available to students in the Distance Career.

The motion carried.

10. Report of the Academic Orientation Committee – Appendix B – for approval
11. **Arts Graduate Council Curriculum Submission Report** – Appendix C – for approval
   Moved by Ms. Jessup, seconded by Ms. King, and carried “that the Arts Graduate Council Curriculum Submission Report – for April, 2015 be approved.”

12. **Revisions to the Faculty of Arts and Science Academic Program Regulations** – Appendix D – for approval
   Moved by Ms. Bénard, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, and carried “that the revisions to the Faculty of Arts and Science Academic Program Regulations be approved.”


14. **Other Business**
   There being no other business the meeting was adjourned.
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