

\*The following is a transcript of the final town hall hosted by the Academic Writing Team on August 17<sup>th</sup> in Wallace Hall.

Yolande: Good afternoon, everyone. We're going to get started, we'd like to invite you to come forward please. We are hoping, first of all that you will be joined by others as they come and rather that they fill in the front we'd rather that they fill in the back. And also we look forward to your contributions. So thank you again for joining us this afternoon. We really look forward to your contributions. Before we start we're just going to introduce ourselves and provide some preliminary comments. Perhaps we'll start over here.

Kim: Kim Nossal from Political Studies.

Jill: Jill Scott from the department of German

Yolande: Yolande Chan from School of Business

Tim: Tim Bryant from Mechanical and Materials Engineering

Michael: And Michael Adams from Pharmacology and Toxicology

Yolande: We very much appreciate you taking the time to be present. I'm pretty sure that you all have followed the process to this point, but the team felt it appropriate to provide some backdrop before we accept your comments. Principal Woolf released on January 15<sup>th</sup> this document (holds up [Where Next: Toward a University Academic Plan](#)) and if you do not have or have not read the document there are additional copies available at the front. Eric Leclerc has these so please just see Eric. Our responsibility as a committee has been not to write the plan, but to respond to the submissions the Principal received in response to Where Next?. And your comments on the submissions, your comments on the actual document are very very welcome. Your comments on Queen's, as we envision this university in the next five to 10 years and deal with challenges, are very very welcome. You know that this team has been meeting since April, that we've had, with today, two town halls and have received you input via our website, via email, and we've had the privilege to meet with individuals who have requested one-on-one meetings – and those are still available if you wish to meet with us privately – we would of course welcome your input and comments. Our report is due to the Principal at the end of this month. Until we submit it to him, your comments are very influential so we look forward to today's discussions. Once the report has been prepared it will be posted on our website, it will be discussed at a senior administration retreat on September first, and it will be presented and hopefully received at Senate. That, believe it or not, is actually the beginning not the end of this set of deliberations because there will be campus-wide discussions for several months following. In fact, the team of students led by the Rector and presidents of the AMS and SGPS will be meeting and forming a response to our document. I'm not going to add additional comments at this time but will invite my colleague Kim Nossal to further talk about what we have been doing and what we hope to achieve this afternoon.

Kim: Thanks very much Yolande and I just wanted to add that we have a chair that is set up here for John Smol who unfortunately sends his regrets, he is in South Africa at present. I just wanted to add my comments and my thanks too, on behalf of all of us, to you for coming out on this lunch hour in the middle of August. As Yolande has said, our job has been to try and formulate some recommendations to the Principal and as Yolande suggested we are in the process of composing our recommendations. As we have stated on a number of occasions, really our job has been to listen for resonances about Queen's future – from the submissions as well as comments from various members of the Queen's community. What we are most interested in is to get some sense of where different parts of the Queen's community see the university in a five to 10 year timeframe. Part of the academic planning process, as many of you know, is to set some fairly long-range goals that will provide an opportunity to those who not only are part of the institution but run the institution, to assess our progress or lack thereof. So one of the things that we've tried to do in the first town hall, and will try to do today, is to get some sense if it's possible of where people think Queen's should be going in the next five to 10 years. The Principal, when he invited us to participate in this, talked about providing him and the planning process with a kind of view from 37,000 feet. In other words, a fairly broad view of the university and that's what we've been trying to do in our deliberations and certainly that in our report to the Principal as Yolande says, will provide the next step in the process and as you know the Principal has agreed that our report is going to be merely one step in an ongoing process to try and provided a view to some of those long-term goals. And so, without any further adieu let me throw it open to members of the community. Once again thank you for taking your lunchtime for sharing your thoughts with us and posing some questions if you have them.

Jill: So I'll just say that I will be fielding the questions. And in addition to what's already been said, I'll add that we have to speak into the microphones, this is being recorded so we will invite people to come up here to the microphone, or to speak into the roaming microphone. And we'd invite you, if you'd like to identify yourself, or not – as you'd prefer. Before the hoards arrive here at the mic, in addition to what's already been said. Some of you have been engaged with us in the past and I was just thinking if there are questions that we should be asking and haven't yet asked and if there's anything you feel strongly about that we should be emphasizing – so I'll just put that out there.

Steve: Steve Biscoe from physiology. I contacted the group some weeks ago and my question is, are there any sacred cows? Are there any programmes at Queen's that might not even be considered academic because your terms of reference are academic ones.

Kim: I'd be happy to take this. As you may have inferred our proceedings are fairly far advanced at this point and one of the things that we've talked about is wanting to ensure that our operations are as tightly bound to the core missions of the university. And whether any of these operations are considered sacred cows, that's not for us to say or to recommend. From that point of view it's not really clear whether we'll be able to say 'here's the sacred cow, and we recommend that it be put to death'. On the other hand, the question of being able to set particular goals that say if in fact these particular things don't contribute to the mission of the university then we need to rethink them.

Yolande: I would just like to add that our deliberations have included all submissions received to the Principal's document in response to Where Next and we received submissions from both academic and non-academic units and we've had many discussions with both academics and non-academics – perhaps those comments are helpful.

Steve: Let me be a little more explicit then, in my email I suggested that perhaps there are some courses at Queen's that aren't truly academic. I could think of say, learning a programming language or a language itself that is very different than learning about Spanish or Roman culture. Your learning a musical instrument, all I'm asking is if there are groups on campus that are calling for 'real academic change' then the definition of academic should be looked at because some of these courses could be considered non-academic. Though I regret using the term sacred cow I don't think those are cows at all.

Michael: I'll take this one. One of the things that we became aware of as a group of six, in very short order, that we had cultural and identity differences from the get-go. We came from very different parts of the campus, our careers have followed a different path, what we do on a day-to-day basis have quite remarkable differences, and again as we met with people who are reflecting on what they had written or hadn't written - we realized again that our awareness as a community was not sufficient to make those kinds of choices. And quite frankly I think that when we look at who we are as a community there are things that go on in this place that we probably do not know anything about. We have to accept that, and going forward one of the things that you have to realize is be careful what you ask for, be careful when making decisions because you need an awful lot of information to reflect on. So that was something that all of us became more and more aware of. We had to agree to disagree a number of times and we have a wonderful group with great collegiality but we also have some differences which are entrenched and those ones have been worked through very very slowly. I know what you're saying Steve, from the perspective from where you sit and how you look at something else in your mind and your assessment of a programme may not be what your expectations are yet we may not understand how that programme operates. That's a difficult place to go and Kim has said it, our role at 37,000 feet is to say where we need to go, emphasizing priorities and real values, recognizing that in the future we may not have everything we have today or what we had 10 years ago – I think everybody's understanding of that – the tough choices are, where will we be exactly in 10 years and what will be our profile of offerings and that one is a much tougher one. But at least if you go in with a series of values and understanding of what you'd like to accomplish day-to-day within your mission I think your choices are a little easier.

Yolande: I just wanted to add by the way that I think Michael's response highlights the fact that we're not going to get down into the trenches with our recommendations, we're staying at a very high level and we're encouraging those who are stakeholders or who have a lot more knowledge than we have with specific programmes to make the very detailed choices and decisions that are required.

Peter: Peter Taylor in Mathematics, I lost track of how imminently your report to the Principal is going forward so I'll just make a couple of comments. I'm interested in our teaching mission and a lot of my comments have come from talking with alumni and seeing what they value. There are two principles I would put forward: One, keep it simple. It's far more complicated than it needs to be. Two, it should be

distinctive. We're a distinctive institution – we can dare to be different. I think there are three things that students need and value, one is good problems and resources. One of the three is not a lot of information as I'm sure you know. The second is good feedback, something needs to be said about that because we're having difficulty providing that because of our size. Students do not need as much feedback as is commonly supposed especially if they've been taught to read critically. And the second thing is that we should only give feedback to their very best work, it makes no sense to do otherwise. Those are two principles that I'll be trying to use this year with first-year students. The third thing they need is informal time with faculty and we have lost a lot of opportunity for that with the heaviness and the complicated fashion with how we organized things at the moment. Thanks.

John: I'm John Fisher, from physiology. I'd like to follow up on how we interest with students and opportunities for how faculty interacts with them. The previous town hall there was some discussion on using IT and different modes of delivery of courses and I think that's a natural evolution. If that evolution is taken forward it will lead to opportunities for third and fourth years in capstone experiences on a small-group basis. But inherent in that type of approach is one of the things raised in Where Next? and that is the ancillary services which are how we deliver our programmes, the IT and that also spills over the research side and how also we handle accounts and how we deal with things. And in the report there was a statement that Queen's not only needs to be known for academic excellence but also for its ability to administer itself well. As a person who deals with this in on a departmental basis, I would encourage you to make broader statements about the quality and vision of how we provide these ancillary services, how we implement them and how we engage students, staff and faculty in making sure that we don't drop the ball as we adopt new systems and new accounting procedures. I think we should adopt the services that will allow us to spend more time focusing on the academic mission.

Yolande: We just wanted to acknowledge that we have heard those comments and have had others echo those concerns and observation and we thank you for those helpful remarks.

Michael: Just to enhance on that, again if you think in terms of resonated themes, that one has a very high tone, it's very common.

Kim: I think that it's fair to say that it's a propos of both of those two last comments. Peter, I think that one of the things that certainly our group has heard quite consistently is the importance of the undergraduate mission and wanting to ensure that there's the kind of balance that certainly the Principal has talked about between the research mission and undergraduate mission. The notion here of simplicity and simplification is something that has resonated quite considerably. And it's not only the simplicity of teaching the students themselves but also the simplicity of programming and the complexities of a particular programme in Arts and Science is something that we're heard considerably. Let me just echo Michael's comment about ancillary services and information management and given what we've heard over the course of the summer, there's no way that these two issues will not be front and centre in our report.

Jill: We have yet to hear from any students and I know that there are very few students here this afternoon, and it reflects the time of year that we're at, but it would be really great to hear student perspectives on some of these issues particularly in regard to the teaching and delivery of programmes.

Victoria: I'm Victoria, the president of the Engineering Society. What was talked about before was that there are metrics available for talking about research professors and whether they are doing well or not but that they were missing in regards to academics and teaching – so if you're good at teaching they aren't available. Has that been talked about at all or worked on? This is something I've heard from other people.

Michael: The concept of metrics is something we've heard many many times. And one of the difficulties is making a decision about something when you don't have the metrics on it. One of the concepts is be careful what you ask for because if you live by metrics you can die by metrics. So it's one of those issues that when you realize what information is very useful how many of your resources are going to be spent on collecting information that ends up not being usable. So you're right, what we need are usable metrics which provide us with a dynamic feedback process and we've heard this over and over again, people need information to make these difficult decisions. We're not just talking about at a unit level or at a programme level or a student level, we're talking about the entire institution. The Queen's community has told us that they need this information to make these kinds of decisions, from the individual student to the programmes so it's something that we have written about.

Yolande: And present today I see a representative from the Centre for Teaching and Learning. We know that we all have metrics that we currently use to measure teacher effectiveness, there had been a lot of discussion of adequacy of those measure and whether or not new metrics should be explored and I know that there's a lot of expertise here on campus that could find alternative or additional ways that we can monitor the contributions instructors make in the classroom.

Kim: As Michael said, one of the things that our group has grappled with is the issue of metrics. As some of you may know we exist in a university system where metrics do not play exactly the same kind of role that they play in other jurisdictions, the UK or Australia for example. But nonetheless there are metrics at work, all you have to do is to think of the Maclean's rankings to see a series of metrics at work. One of the things that we've sought to do is to try and bring the discussion of what kind of measurements should be employed as we look at how to measure where Queen's is going to do. So your question about metrics for teaching is an absent one, but as Michael has said, there are metrics all over the place in all aspects of what this institution seeks to do.

Kelly: My name is Kelly Smith and I am a support staff member and I work in the faculty of Arts and Science. One of the things that I would like to see as a recommendation from the Academic Writing Team is one of the other sides of the coin – Principal Woolf's Where Next? document is just the start of this process and it to create a viable academic plan but part of what I think is missing for staff is the ability for us to really participate in that process. I personally have read the document several times and find it difficult to reach out and touch anything tangible in that document. Part of what's missing at the moment is although we talk about teaching and services, but what we don't talk about is the ways that

we can deliver those services and improve that teaching. To do that you really need to connect with your support staff, your people on the ground who are essentially helping to make that work. As a recommendation, communication with support staff really needs to be improved. Staff are sometimes reluctant to speak out, feel a little nervous sometimes in open forums so there needs to be some creative strategies on how to cull that wealth of knowledge out of staff and I know that sounds difficult to achieve but I think the Principal needs to put some effort into doing that. Now is the time where staff can step up to the plate and offer our support in this plan and make it something that's truly going to show some strength in the next decade.

Kim: Thanks very much Kelly. Our group met with members of QUSA, the staff association and that's certainly something that we heard and our assessment of Where Next? and the responses to it conclude that staff need to be seen as a more central player in the process, and this will be central in our recommendations. Can I just ask, if there aren't any questions here. Someone mentioned that Queen's was a distinctive institution and I would like to hear your thoughts about what makes it distinctive in your minds.

Michael: Even using one word or two words at a time.

Answers: Community, history, calibre of students.

Roberta: I have more than one word. Queen's was distinctive when it emphasized its undergraduate education, when we had enough faculty to offer the programmes that we offered very well. We have lost that reputation and we need to recognize that and know that if we're going to be a distinctive university again, we need to know what we did very well and that it is offering a great undergraduate education. I have heard from students that Queen's lied to me, they did everything they could to get me here and what am I doing? Sitting in a class of hundreds for all my first year. I'm in music, for the record I'm Roberta Lamb. We are totally undergraduate and we have done it very well and continue to try and do it very well. We do not have the faculty to sustain the department. We have been promised by the university at the faculty level for decades that if we did x they would give us another faculty member – that has not happened. We have no reason to believe anything that comes from the administration. Everything we have done, the administration has not followed through on. We have an excellent, unique programme it's called the Bachelor of Music Bachelor of Education Concurrent Education, the students coming into that programme have the highest GPAs as you know from looking at the data. Since we began that programme our applications have gone up, we have increased our numbers by 25% and our faculty go down. We cannot sustain what we are doing, our people are ill and we have no way of planning for the future. I probably shouldn't say this but I will, I know the same thing is happening at the University of Toronto. Their music school is being asked to make closer ties with the Royal Conservatory, one of the things that we did was to begin a conservatory here. That was one of the things that was supposed to bring us another faculty person, but it did not. I think that it is highly possible that we will see, by the time my generation retires, that there are no music faculties in Ontario at all. Just as the language departments are being cut off, the arts departments are being cut off, we'll build buildings but they won't in the end be used for the arts. My generation is the one that is running the School of Music, within five to 10 years we will retire and that's a good time to close the School of

Music and it has nothing to do with academic planning, none of this has anything to do with academic planning.

Kim: Could I ask you a question? You make reference to what's been happening at other places this is as you are well aware, something that is fundamentally systemic.

Roberta: If you mean that the lack of funding for higher education is systemic I'll agree to that.

Kim: Yes and let me just ask you if could share with us your sense of how to deal with that structural problem. You have a very particular view and any department of music is going to have a very particular view because of the way that music has to be passed from professors to students.

Roberta: Yes, music schools are always, next to medicine, the most expensive departments to run in a university. There's no question, it's always been that way.

Kim: And yet many universities take the view that you can't be a university unless you have that full panoply of programmes including the expensive programmes to run. How would you deal with the structural problem of the shifting nature of resources being allocated to universities change. As professorial and other salary costs go up, tuition remains relatively flat, the government grant is unpredictable at the best of times – how do we deal with that.

Roberta: If I were queen of the world I would start by lobbying the provincial government.

Kim: But that's being done.

Roberta: But I would increase it. If I were the Principal I would get all of my employee groups together, all my student groups together and say that we are going to carry a message to the provincial government that the future of Ontario is being short changed because the universities of Ontario are underfunded. I don't see that happening. I see division happening and that is part of the problem. I talked to Caroline Davies who was being interviewed outside and she was talking about the Queen's pension plan and how the three wise people were working up a solution to the Queen's pension plan and that they would be collaborating with the employee groups. I said to her and the reporter that the employee groups were at the table for five years, we were this close in December of 2009 to achieving a solution. In January there was supposed to be a meeting, Principal Woolf cancelled it. He had no further contact with the employee groups. In June he appointed three people who did not know anything about the Queen's pension plan negotiations to come up with the solution. Why did the Principal break off those negotiations? They represented all of the members of the pension plan. We could have had a solution in December. I would look forward to having each of the faculties having their own academic plan. We're never had an academic plan within Arts and Science. Our departments have gone through internal academic reviews. We spent thousands of dollars doing those reports with no follow up – no wonder why we don't trust the administration. I would really look to ways to cooperatively engage all of us who have been making suggestions only to be ignored.

Kevin: I'm Kevin Dennison, audio visual tech here at Queen's. In answer to your question in a limited way on how to deal with this I'll say what the university should not do and that is to collapse in any sort

of way. The School of Business is probably the most successful unit academically on campus as far as I know. I think the administration should take what it can from the School of Business and concentrate on the business of education and rather than cut here, there and everywhere, maintain the quality and the volume of the education so that, as in any business you have gains and losses, and the gains take time to gain back. I think Queen's has the knowledge to acquire the business savvy to maintain quality without cutting. Everybody lost money with the economic depression but I think they can lean on the business school to deal with those issues.

Jenn: Jenn Stephenson, I'm in Drama. This is a small thing really, you asked what makes Queen's distinctive and one of those things is that within the Faculty of Arts and Science we offer medials. People always say what the heck is a medial? They understand majors yes, and minors yes, but what is a medial? I'm a little disheartened at the trend to discontinue some of the medials particularly with the arts and science combinations. I love the idea of a drama-biology medial or a physics-music, that really turns me on I think it's fascinating, enriching for our students and I think we need to find ways to allow students to make those really radical crossovers between disciplines.

Kim: Can I just make a comment here? It's interesting when students come up with what one considered from a disciplinary perspective, sort of a neat combination. There are something like in Arts and Science, 1600 of those interesting combinations. What is your view of the corollary in essence, to that when you get a group of departments that seek to create a set of highly complex programme requirements – check out the size of the academic calendar and see how many requirements are put on students all in the name of providing them with an appropriate education in that particular discipline, what it actually ends up with is a particularly problematic experience for students as they try and negotiate these complex arrangements imposed on them by different departments. The programme combination is great provided that we could encourage departments to simplify things a lot more.

Jenn: Yes I know where you're coming from. Departments say to students, 'in order to graduate with x you need all of these following courses'. I wonder if in fact the question is larger as to ask what then, is the goal of the undergraduate programme? What kind of specialization or non-specialization is required of a four-year degree? How many students are going on to very specialized post-graduate programmes? How many students are going on to do Master's degree where that kind of information is required and my own sense of it would be to focus increasingly on core skills, on critical thinking, on information management, on skills which transcend discipline. The discipline would then simply become the container for these transferable skills and from my point of view that's what an undergraduate education is about and if you look at it from that perspective, there's no reason why you can't have a drama-biology medial and how that should not prevent you from going on to graduate education.

Jill: This is a very important conversation to have. I would like to hear from students because I know that when we have these complex structures around programmes we make is difficult for students to engage in interdisciplinary work and if you think about it, all of these combinations came about because students had interdisciplinary interests. In the process of concentrating on what it is that we want students to know or to have mastered with certain material, often gets in the way of following new kinds of thinking and learning. The question that I would pose is, what kind of learners are we

developing? What kind of learning do we want to foster? And how do we then foster that kind of learning? And so I put that question out to the students or the faculty.

Safiah: Safiah Chowdhury AMS President. It's difficult for me and Victoria to speak on behalf of the 14,000 undergraduate students but I think that student engagement is a huge part of what makes Queen's distinctive. The timeline of the retreat and the requirement of having the report due in a month does a disservice to the student agency given the fact that most students will return for September 13<sup>th</sup> which is probably why you see a lack of student representation in this room today. When it comes to interdisciplinarity, one thing I've heard from a lot of students is that programme cuts require that classes become exclusive to the majors or the medials which prevents a lot of students from taking classes they would otherwise be interested in. This really impacts the level of interdisciplinarity especially within Arts and Science. This is within the broader framework of programme cuts, faculty loss and that whole spectrum of problems facing Queen's.

Michael: We've communicated with the Principal's Office and our understanding is that there will be a lot of opportunity for further changes in the process. We're providing an answer to the Where Next? document using the information provided up to today, that does not mean that this will be the end of it. In our book this is the beginning of a process where we're generating some resonating themes in the first salvo and after that, there will be enhancements and adjustments. My recommendation is to stay engaged in the process and as students come back, get them to get them engaged as there is real opportunity to contribute over the next few months. My take on what's been said is that I think we've all heard that there's been a real change in how the university should enhance the learning environment. I come from the Faculty of Health Sciences and there has been a dramatic shift, I'm talking 180 degree turn from where we were three years ago in terms of what our expectations are from students – over there we call it competency development, examining what we think the competencies are. We're seeing this is a lot of jurisdictions where people are saying that they want students to have developed along these competencies in a sufficient manner so that they're functional. Now, describing what those are requires a lot of detail but I think we're hearing from a lot of people that no longer is it just content. We're recognizing that just throwing large volumes at them is not the way to get them to learn. Everyone is saying that, for the university to turn away from that would be silly, on the other hand, I'm not sure that makes us distinctive. This is a paradigm that's across the world and people recognize that in order to deal with the amount of information available to all students that if you simply go down that track you will be overwhelmed by an avalanche of stuff, much of it wrong. Therefore, we have to advance their skills but we have to advance their skills in a way that will have them recognize their own skills and continue to grow within that. Sometimes you have to give students time to become self-aware of what they lack, just us telling them what they are weak at is not going to help them. There are all kinds of paradigms in this that we are hearing from people, the greatest difficulty is that the vocabulary is quite different. Everyone uses a slightly different vocabulary across the disciplines when we actually mean the same things. But I do think there's got to be an overall change in how we deliver and this will give us an opportunity to engage in an awful lot of really exciting things.

Unidentified Person: I would just like to speak to the issue of programme complexity because I think that in some cases that term is doing double service to a different issue. Ten years ago there wasn't much of

a problem managing a host of curriculum choices in English where I teach, and even in dealing with medials despite the fact that there are numerous medial combinations. What has changed about the rising complaints about programme complexity is that the richness of offerings has fallen so that ten years ago we were offering 50 courses sections in English and now I think we're down to 34/35. If you have fewer course offerings you will have fewer double sections, you will have more trouble satisfying the demands of students demanding rich programmes. I agree with Peter in that simplicity is good but there are some places in an academic system where you need complexity – especially in the day of computerized registration. I would not make a priority of reducing complexity of programme selections themselves, I agree that the medial is a marvellous degree. There doesn't seem to be an academic reason for getting rid of medials or for simplifying the complexity of programmes, there seems to be a resource issue. I'm not saying that I've got the solution to the resource issue but I think there are other places to go here and I think we should at least be calling things by their correct names.

Roberta: I don't know if this question was asked of the panel already and if it was then you don't have to answer it again. You've talked about how you spent the summer collecting information from the people in the university community and yet I know of only two town hall meetings that were scheduled. What other kinds of information collection did you engage in?

Yolande: Thanks Roberta, we've had the privilege to interact with the community of Queen's in many ways. Both through the website and we thank you all who have submitted your comments through the site and through emails, again we thank the many who sent emails to us – again it's just [academic.writing.team@queensu.ca](mailto:academic.writing.team@queensu.ca). We have also taken meetings with individuals and groups who have requested meetings with us and as a result of town halls and also independently of town halls we've had requests and have been privileged to meet with student groups, staff groups, alumni and so on. We have really focused on listening, that has been our primary role. We've not been able to have as many opportunities to describe where we're at in terms of our preliminary recommendations simply because of time and the fact that all six of us have not had any reductions in our other responsibilities. So we focus primarily on receiving versus speaking and we know that the Principal has extended the planning process significantly so that this is just the beginning of the discussions, this is in no way a terminal step. The Principal has assured us that there will be a number of opportunities for students, staff and faculty to provide comments on our comments, and to continue to comment on the Where Next? document.

Roger: Hi, I'm Roger Healy from Institutional Research and Planning and I was wondering if you've had any thoughts about the support staff, they represent a tremendous resource at Queen's and we often hear from the administration and from faculty members that they are very highly valued. I just wondered if there's been any thought given to refocusing or reinventing how the staff support the academic mission at the university.

Kim: Certainly, we've had discussions as we indicated before when I responded to Kelly. One of the things that we want to do is to refocus attention on the importance on the staff. We recognize from what we see in both the documents and from what we hear that the staff, in a sense maybe even more so than the professoriate, are very much under stress as a result of shifts in the way in which resources

are deployed. I was a department head for eight years here and could see on my own staff, the number of things that had been downloaded to them from the centre which creates essentially increasing pressure on them. That's something that seems to me that needs to be focused on in particular, rather than seeing the pressures created by the problem of resources as something purely manifested at the level of the professoriate – and that is something that is difficult to do. We do see, as part of our role, the need to signal to whoever is going to read these recommendations to the Principal in the context of planning the importance of valuing staff. That requires that certain things will flow from that. Certainly in our discussions, we're going to see things happen if this is embraced as a goal.

Jill: Can I just say couple of things about that? First of all, our team is acutely aware that we do have staff representation on the committee and that's a factor that we have to acknowledge. It limits our perspective to a certain extent. A couple of other things that I wanted to mention is that when anyone talks about Queen's values the word community often comes up and we have to ask what we mean by 'community'. I think that means to a certain degree, the seamlessness that the staff, faculty and students engage together to achieve the core missions. The second thing that I want to say is that we have had a lot of conversations about people's time. I think that one of the things that we've become aware of is that when we look at resources, we really do have to calculate people's time. We look at budgets and see numbers, soft money and hard money but we don't look at the actual cost of a meeting when you've got 10 or 15 people in a room for an hour or two. This town hall is costing Queen's some money and I just want to say that we are very much aware that everybody is under major time constraints and I think that one of the things that has happened at universities and institutions in general is the increasing regulations that require us to document and track and paper all kinds of things that maybe in the past were done on a much more informal basis. I think that we do need to look at these things very carefully – where we are putting our resources and where we can then use people's time in appropriate ways.

Michael: As you can imagine, we've had a lot of conversations about this. And one of the things is the struggle to deal with it and the collection of metrics and the coordination and distribution of the metrics in a usable way will allow us to see more of the problems and maybe more of the solutions. I think the concept of a Queen's community that is seeing the information and allow it to help with the next steps is something we're hearing over and over again. We've got a serious problem in coming up with solutions in this environment and we realize that having everyone engaged as part of the solving of the problems is the only way to do it. That said, it doesn't mean that every single problem can be solved and that's the greatest difficulty that we face, we can't solve everything we're going to have to prioritize. There may be solutions that we haven't thought about yet and as Kim was saying, when you value staff you can't deliver if you don't have staff. If the logic is to flow from that then allocate the resources to staff appropriately and make possible to deliver an important programme.

Yolande: Unfortunately, we are out of time we thank you once again for coming today and ask you to keep contributing to the process by emailing us or talking to us in person.