A meeting of Faculty Board was held on Friday, May 2, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. in School of Kinesiology and Health Studies Building, Room 101. Mr. Ascough was in the Chair.

1. Adoption of the Agenda
   Once quorum was reached the agenda was adopted.

2. Approval of the Minutes
   Moved by Mr. Akl, seconded by Mr. Morelli and carried, ‘that the Minutes of April 11, 2014 be approved’.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
   Mr. Ascough noted that Mr. Wandschneider, Queen’s Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice-Principal, who presented Queen’s plan to migrate to Office 365, has posted more detailed responses to some of the questions raised at the last faculty Board meeting on his blog at http://www.queensu.ca/connect/cio/2014/04/14/responding-to-faculty-questions-on-moving-to-the-cloud/.

   At the last Faculty Board meeting a vote was held to elect Faculty Board representatives to Senate. Ms. Walker, who was elected at that meeting, was not able to carry out the duties and so the Ms. Bachmann, who had the next most votes, was elected.

4. Dean’s Report
   a. General Report
      The full text of the Dean’s report can be found on the Arts and Science website (http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/about/faculty-board).
      The Dean thanked Faculty Board and the staff of the faculty for their patience and helpfulness as she nears the completion of her first year as a Dean at Queen’s.

      The Dean announced that Associate Dean Cathy Krull will be leaving Queen’s in July to take the position of Dean of Social Sciences at the University of Victoria.

      The Dean was happy to announce that unlike last year when Queen’s missed its enrollment targets, the BA, BSc and the Bachelor of Computing are all projected to meet their targets.

      Mr. Morelli asked that if faculty renewal was dependent on enrollment growth, as was suggested at Senate, what was the plan for faculty renewal. The Dean replied that the process starts with replacing faculty that retire or depart from Queen’s for those positions that are affordable. This is to ensure there are faculty in place to teach those additional students as enrollment grows.

      In a follow-up question Ms. Lord asked for news of the ‘emergency repair positions’. The Dean acknowledged that 4 such positions were approved this year: Mathematics & Statistics,
Sociology, English and Political Studies; History would have been a fifth but they acquired a QNS position. The Dean explained that the Faculty will be asking for 4 ‘emergency repair positions’, which are based on teaching need, each year for the next few years.

In answering Ms. Lord’s question concerning the Provost’s support of the faculty renewal plan, the Dean felt that the current Provost does support the renewal plan in the context of the current 3-year budget plan.

Ms. Lord asked when a department should request retirement positions. The Dean noted that retirements will be on the agenda of the next Committee of Department meeting (May 14th) and that she is working with the Provost to determine how best to request these positions.

Mr. Grotsky asked if as enrollment increased would the funding to shared services also increase. The Dean responded that since the shared services budget is 37% of the University revenue, as enrollment increases so will revenue and so will the amount available to the shared services.

Mr. Morelli asked for clarification on the role of the Provost since in the new budget model the Faculties are responsible for managing their budget. The Dean responded that during the transition, and even once the budget model is fully implemented, it is the Provost that is accountability for the University’s financial health. But decisions as to which positions are needed will be made by the Faculty and increasingly by the Department.

5. Report from Arts & Science Undergraduate Society
Mr. Grotsky, the ASUS President who took office the day before the meeting, gave a brief report.

ASUS will implement a new program called “Life After ArtSci” that will include an improved ArtSci career fair, practical skills workshops and mentorship programs.

ASUS also hopes to have the departmental student councils (DSC) receive feedback from students about their department that can be compiled and given to department heads in an effort to work with departments to create change.

6. Question Period
Mr. Iscoe asked how many appeals are made to the Associate Dean (Studies), how many are approved and if the course instructors are notified of the appeal outcomes. Mr. Horton indicated that the Academic Progress Report, which includes the statistics on appeals, was presented at the April Faculty Board meeting. Mr. Horton clarified that information provided by the instructor is taken into account when an appeal decision is made. However, instructors may not have all the information that goes into judging the student’s appeal and for this reason instructor may not agree with the Associate Dean’s decision. To protect confidentiality the instructor is informed of the decision but not the reasons for the decision.

7. Communications
Mr. Ascough reminded Faculty Board of the special May 7th Faculty Board meeting where Mr. Tanner will present a summary of the proposed budget model.
Mr. Ascough made Faculty Board aware that the Nominating Committee is looking to fill position on the Nominating Committee, Curriculum Committee, Academic Orientation Committee and the Board of Studies. If you know of members who would be willing to serve send their names to Mr. Kavana gh, Chair of the Nominating Committee until July 1st, Ms. Jamieson or Mr. Ascough.

8. Other Business

Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) Ravenscroft addressed Faculty Board concerning the governance and decision making structure of Continuing and Distance Studies (CDS). Her written report to similar questions asked by Senate is available on the Senate website. Ms. Ravenscroft highlighted several points regarding CDS before taking questions. She noted that CDS has been through several name and structural changes in its history as an Arts and Science service. It currently has 14 staff and partners with academic units to offer course. The academic unit has full control over the course content, selection of the instructor, selection of TAs and if the course will be offered in a given year. The mandate of CDS is to support the design and delivery of online courses.

Ms. Little recounted that she had recently been made aware of the drop in mature women using the Ban Righ Centre and that reason for the drop in numbers was the policy that that you must take 4 online course before you are eligible to take on-campus courses. Ms. Ravenscroft replied that as a result enrollment increases and a reduction in capacity the decision was made to redirect all non-degree students to CDS.

Ms. Monte asked why the spring/summer evening sessions for courses that were quite popular are no longer offered. Ms. Ravenscroft said the reason was that enrollments were not covering the course of the courses.

Mr. Morelli asked how the workload for teaching CDS courses was established. Ms. Ravenscroft noted that setting workload is the responsibility of the departments not CDS.

Mr. Straker was curious about what happens when a course designer and an instructor disagree on how to implement a particular learning outcome or content. Ms. Ravenscroft acknowledged that these issues are typically solved by collaboration but stated that the academic department has the final say on course content and delivery.

Mr. Iscoe asked if there is any analysis of course results to ensure that online courses are achieving the same educational results as their on-campus counterparts. Ms. Ravenscroft thought that such an analysis would be useful and that it would be in a department’s interest to ensure equivalency between online and on-campus courses. Mr. Iscoe suggested that a requirement to compare the two delivery formats should be done perhaps every 3 years. Noting, in addition, that consistency across delivery formats seems hard to accomplish. Ms. Atkinson added that the 1st year course in psychology, which has an on-campus, online and castile version, uses the same final exam to check consistency across the versions and may help other departments address the issue of consistency.

Mr. Straker pointed out that the grade distribution for online courses is different from that of the on-campus version, even when the course is taught by the same instructor and asked if this
was being monitored. Ms. Ravenscroft replied that tracking of grades is the responsibility of the department. Ms. Atkinson pointed out that Heads must sign off on all course grade submissions.

Mr. Morelli asked about the ratio of on-campus and off-campus students taking courses through CDS. Ms. Ravenscroft said the ratio was 80/20 (on-campus/off-campus). Mr. Morelli also asked if CDS was profitable. Ms. Ravenscroft remarked that the goal was to grow the enrollment of off-campus CDS students which brings in revenue without putting pressure on campus resources, such as residence. Since deciding to invest in CDS enrollments have doubled, offerings have increased, quality has improved, and the level of student service has increased.

Mr. Morelli asked if there was some mechanism to ensure quality in the online offerings. Mr. Beamish interjected to say that since units are in charge of the programs deliver so no oversight is needed. Mr. Iscoe clarified that a requirement for course evaluation is not the same as oversight.

Ms. Lord asked if there was a way to rethink the policy that mature student need to do 4 online courses before being able to take on-campus courses. Ms. Ravenscroft suggested that a simple policy causes less confusion among non-degree students who are not those targeted by planned enrollment. Ms. Lord lamented the reduction in mature student enrollment as they added to the complexity of the conversation in the classroom.
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