A meeting of Faculty Board was held on Friday, March 7, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in School of Kinesiology and Health Studies Building, Room 101. Mr. Ascough was in the Chair.

Adoption of the Agenda
Move by Mr. Hanes, seconded by Mr. Fort and with item 8, the Teaching and Learning Action Plan, moved to item 6, carried.

Approval of the Minutes
Moved by Mr. Fort, seconded by Mr. Morelli, and with a minor change, carried.

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

Dean’s Report
Dean Mumtaz reported highlighted several items.
  - The Director of Advancement, Beth McCarthy, has taken a position at the University of Toronto and a replacement is being sought.
  - The Initiative Campaign goal for the Faculty of Arts and Science has reached 99% of its initial goal of 70 million dollars with at more than one year to run.
  - The Faculty Office relocation to Dunning Hall is on schedule with the physical move happening in August, 2014 as planned.
  - Mr. Tanner gave an update from the Business Model Advisory Committee.

Mr. Tanner presented a conceptual model of the budget process, highlighting the objectives of the budget and briefly reviewing the budget schematic that was handed out (attached). Since the model is not complete, final budget numbers for departments are not yet available. Mr. Tanner stressed that all the model is doing is taking the monies received from the University and allocating it more transparently and create incentives to increase revenues to relieve the financial constraints on the Faculty.

Mr. Lucas asked how compulsory, tuition-related, ancillary fees, such as lab fees, fit into the new model.

Mr. Tanner responded that these fees are outside the scope of the model and the province has guidelines on ancillary fees that the University follows.

A question was asked about Faculty-based research centers and Mr. Tanner admitted that this was one of the areas that still need to be addressed.
Ms. Reinholtz asked if there would be an opportunity for individual units to ask questions once the budget model is populated with some numbers.

Mr. Tanner replied that once the model has some numbers it will be presented to Department Heads. Dean Mumm added that Department Heads will take it to their members with multiple opportunities for consultation.

Mr. Reinholtz also asked about how students taking Medial and Minor degrees were handled in the budget.

Mr. Tanner clarified that students taking Medials and Areas of Specialization count as undergraduate teaching FTE whereas those taking Minors get captured in the course enrollment teaching credit.

In a follow-up, Ms. Lord asked, since there are several units that do not have a Major degree, such as the LLCU, and would not get a share of the teaching FTE monies, that the budget committee review how Minors are counted.

Mr. Morelli noted that other universities that have implemented a similar budget model have found that it works against interdisciplinary cooperation, creating an ‘us-versus-them’ mentality. He felt that it was no unreasonable to imagine that, for example, Engineering would claw back course currently taught by Arts & Science, which would have budget implications.

Dean Mumm responded to the notion of student poaching and the lack of interdisciplinary cooperation by saying that there may be some risk of poaching and protectionism, but, in her experience, Faculties come to realize that these actions do not add students to the university and therefore have little benefit to the university as a whole. In addition, Queen’s has adopted a ‘hold-harmless policy’, where deficits in one unit are covered by the surpluses in another unit. So if we poach students from another faculty and, as a result, cause a deficit, we would have to subsidize that unit. So a reasoned, collegial approach is best.

Ms. Walker asked if the Faculty Fund, mentioned at earlier meetings, was in the budget document.

Mr. Tanner replied that that aspect of the budget is still under discussion and not in reflected in the budget model presented.

**Report from Arts & Science Undergraduate Society (ASUS)**
Mr. Mason introduced his successor, Mr. Grotsky, the current academic commissioner. The Mark R. Wilson Award, the highest tribute the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society may award to an Arts and Science student for valuable and distinguished service to the University in non-athletic extra-curricular activities, will be decided the following weekend as will several other ASUS scholarships.

Mr. Grotsky noted that Departmental Student Council elections (DSC) are currently underway and this is the first year that there have been standardized, online elections. The new ASUS council has been hired and Mr. Grotsky introduced Ms. Graham the new academic commissioner.
Teaching and Learning Action Plan – Appendix B – for information

Ms. Scott, Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning reported on the Teaching and Learning Action Plan. After acknowledging the work of the Task Force members, Ms. Scott spoke of the changes in the post-secondary especially with respect to the advancement of learning technologies and how to support faculty members in applying these changes. The answer lies in moving to a learning outcomes framework and evidence based practice. The principles that underlie the report’s recommendations are: they should be actionable, high-impact, sustainable, cost effective and informed by evidence based practice in teaching and learning. The full report and recommendations can be viewed at http://www.queensu.ca/provost/index.html and clicking on “Teaching and Learning Action Plan” link on the lower left panel.

Mr. Robertson asked how one ascertains what the Faculties are doing with respect to academics and career development and are assuming that Faculties are not doing this at present. Ms. Scott replied that while all faculties are involved with career development and advising, it is a case of trying to better support students in their career decisions and integrating this process with student advising.

Ms. Duchaine noted that neither of her Departments, History or Politics, has placed any emphasis on what can be done beyond the undergraduate degree. Recognizing the inconsistency across departments, she suggested that the good work in being done in some department be used as a model for others.

Mr. Morelli commented that this task force should have been struck by Senate rather than the Provost office and that the Task Force has no power to implement these recommendations. Mr. Morelli asked if there were any reports, based on the Queen’s experience, of courses that have been redesigned.

Ms. Scott replied that the Provost speaking to Senate said that any recommendations under the jurisdiction of Senate will come to Senate by the Senate committees. She noted that the collection of evidence on student learning and engagement is ongoing.

Mr. Carson appreciated the report and felt the recommendations made sense. He made 2 points. Firstly, the experience of the instructor should count alongside the role of evidence. It may be that relying too heavily on evidence reduces the value of the human experience. Secondly, only using learning outcomes ignores the serendipitous quality of learning. There should be some consideration of the learning that comes between courses and years and that cannot be quantified. Students will make of their education what they will regardless of the outcomes specified by the instructor.

Ms. Scott agreed with Mr. Carson on the importance of recognizing the human element. It is hoped that developing and using learning outcomes will help the students articulate their learning to themselves and others and to understand better what they received from their education. It was reported that in a recent ‘Prof Panel’ one discussion point was the reduction in the quality of teaching after tenure is achieved. Assessing learning outcomes will help instructors gauge their progress as they adjust their teaching methods.
Mr. Lucas wondered if the report addressed centralizing training and web resources as well as creating some year-to-year continuity in the tools used to deliver services and teaching.

Ms. Scott replied that the question of centralizing resources occupied much of the Task force’s time and that improved coordination was a real need particularly around learning management systems. While no immediate solution was found.

Mr. Greenfield asked why the committee’s membership did not include a representative of the group of nearly 2000 instructors that will be affected by the recommendations. The Task Force was aware that the teaching faculty was not well represented and in setting the Task Force to consider the technical issues across all faculties, the task force may have been unbalanced in that direction.

**Question Period**

In light of draft report by the Strategic Enrolment Management Group, a question was asked how the Faculty will update its policy on upper year transfers.

The Dean responded that the idea of increasing upper transfers is new to the Faculty as it does not have a history of seeking upper year transfers but there are programs that have capacity in the upper years. This year the emphasis will be on recruiting students into select programs where there is capacity through a nation-wide campaign.

Ms. Beauchemin asked who was consulted on the program closure document that was submitted to Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD).

The Dean replied that the document sent from the Dean’s office was based on the opinions of the Dean and Associate Deans and she was not aware of which others groups were solicited for input.

Ms. Duchaine asked for clarification about the procedures for the election of Faculty Senators.

Mr. Ascough responded that the Nominating Committee is the body that nominates people to committees and it is currently looking for 6-10 Faculty members to serve on Senate. If interested you should contact Mr. Kavanagh at bjk2@queensu.ca.

**Communications**

Mr. Ascough responded to a letter received from Mr. Morelli, Department of Physics, Engineering Physics & Astronomy – Appendix A
Mr. Ascough responded:

Dear Mr. Morelli,

Thank you for your letter. I will respond to each of the issues you raise in turn.

Your letter is the first notice I have had of the draft SCAD policy on the Closure of Programs. I was not aware of SCAD’s request for feedback from various stakeholders. Following receipt of your letter I communicated with the secretary and the Chair of SCAD, who confirmed that I was not included in the original email. They also confirmed that SCAD did not explicitly request feedback from Faculty Boards. This does not preclude Faculty Boards from providing feedback. In order for this to happen, however, someone would have had to bring it to my attention as a potential agenda item. Many members of our Faculty Board were aware of the SCAD request, as the initial SCAD email went to Senators, AMS representatives, SGPS representatives, and QUFA representatives, among others, any one of whom might have brought it to my attention for the agenda. No one did, hence I did not know about it and thus it was not even considered as an item for the meeting. Since there was no pressing issues, the meeting was cancelled.

As a result of your letter, I did ask whether SCAD would consider extending the deadline beyond the next FAS Faculty Board meeting and was told that this is not possible. Nevertheless, there will be another opportunity for faculty members to provide feedback. The plan is for the proposal to go forward to Senate with a Notice of Motion at the March 25th Senate followed by a Motion to approve at the April 29th meeting. So there is no shortage of opportunities for review, feedback, and discussion.

You ask that a copy of the draft SCAD policy be circulated to all members of Faculty Board. Since I was not a recipient of this document nor was I solicited for feedback, it is not my place to forward this document. I have, however, passed on your request to the Chair of SCAD.

In terms of the issue you raise with respect to counting abstentions from voting, I can assure you that I share your reading of Bourinot in this regard. I have not, nor would I, count abstentions for or against a motion. They are called for simply for the record. That said, the total of all votes for and against, plus abstentions must, at least, equal quorum.

As you request, I will include your letter under “Communications” on the next Faculty Board agenda. I shall address the issues at that time in the meeting, the substance of which shall be as per the above responses.

Mr. Morelli suggested that the Dean, among others, might have brought the SCAD policy on Closure of Programs document to Faculty Board.
Dean Mumm responded that many groups were copied on the policy and none brought it to the attention of the Board. The Dean felt that directing the Board to consider topics of her choosing might be seen as directing the deliberations of Faculty Board, which some might see as illegitimate.

Ms. Duchaine, who sits on SCAD, offered to send the Closure of Programs document to any interested Faculty Board member. You can contact Ms. Duchaine by email at 8SIRD@queensu.ca

Mr. Morelli suggested that at its next meeting Faculty Board discuss the impact of blended learning and online courses on student performance, faculty workload and the potential increase in breaches of academic integrity.

The Department of Film and Media change the name of the Department to the School of Film, Media and Cultural Studies – Appendix C – for approval
Moved by Ms. Lord, seconded by Mr. Robertson and carried “that the Department of Film and Media change the name of the Department to the School of Film, Media, and Cultural Studies.”

Ms. Murray asked why an undergraduate degree in Cultural Studies should be placed under the umbrella of Film when Cultural Studies is multidisciplinary.

Ms. Lord responded that Cultural Studies in not ‘under’ Film but is in a School that includes film but Cultural Studies will be its own separate program.

Mr. Straker asked if the establishment of Major, Media, and Minor in Cultural Studies will limit other departments from developing and delivering courses in Cultural Studies.

Ms. Lord clarified that the intent was to have departments collaborate on the development of courses.

Mr. Carson noted that Cultural Studies is a ‘hot’ topic right now and an undergraduate program in Cultural Studies has the potential for substantial revenue generation in the future.

Mr. Lord felt that only time would tell if such a program would generate substantial revenue.

Mr. Robinson noted that the current proposal was discussed and had approval from members in the Cultural Studies Graduate program.

Curriculum Committee Omnibus Report – Appendix D - for approval
Moved by Mr. Greenfield, seconded by Mr. Ableson and carried “that the Omnibus Report Part V be approved.”

Course Variants – Appendix E- for approval
Moved by Mr. Greenfield, seconded by Ms. Duchaine and carried “that the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee in response to the Faculty Board motion of December, 2013 related to approval of course variants be approved.”
Arts Graduate Council Curriculum Submission Report – Appendix F – for approval
Moved by Ms. Jessup, seconded by Ms. Lord and carried “that the Arts Graduate Council Curriculum Submission Report – January-February, 2014 be approved.”

Science Graduate Council Curriculum Submission Report – Appendix G – for approval
This motion was deferred.

Report of the Academic Orientation Committee – Appendix H – for approval
Moved by Ms. Chivers, seconded by Mr. Hanes and carried “that the Academic Orientation Committee Report on Orientation 2014 be approved.”

Other Business
There was no other business.

Richard Ascough
Chair
Faculty Board

Patrick Costigan
Secretary
Faculty Board