Minutes of the Annual Meeting
Queen’s University Council
in its 135\textsuperscript{th} year

Academic Planning
Saturday, May 1, 2010

Appendices:
A. Attendance at the Annual Meeting
B. Distinguished Service Award Citations
C. Board of Trustees Governance Review
D. Report of the University Council Governance Task Force
E. Small Group Session summary
A meeting of the University Council of Queen’s University was held on Saturday, May 1, 2010 in the Ellis Auditorium.

1. **Open Session**

Chancellor David Dodge welcomed everyone to the 135th Annual Meeting of the University Council. He acknowledged the outstanding attendance as a testament to the desire of the wider Queen’s community to contribute to the future welfare of the University.

The Chancellor asked for a moment of silence in memory of Keith Norton, Murray Gill and Robert James Uffen, members of Council who passed away during the previous year.

2. **Approval of the Minutes of May 1, 2009**

Moved by Krystyna Williamson, seconded by Innes van Nostrand, that the Minutes of the May 1, 2009 meeting be approved as circulated. Carried

3. **Election of University Council Secretary**

The Chancellor noted that at its meeting on March 3, 2010 the University Council Executive Committee recommended the appointment of a new Secretary of the University Council, to be ratified by University Council at its annual meeting on May 1, 2010. He thanked Peggy Watkin for her 13 years of service as Council Secretary and commended her on her excellent work.

The Chancellor introduced Celia Russell of the Office of the University Secretariat, noting that Queen’s roots run deep in Ms. Russell’s family. She is a graduate of Queen’s, as are her sister and brother. Her father is Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, K.E. Russell.

Moved by D. Woolf, seconded by A. MacLean and agreed:

That, on the recommendation of the University Council Executive Committee, Celia Russell be appointed the Secretary of the University Council. Carried

4. **Council Election Results**

The Chancellor congratulated graduates elected and re-elected to the Council in this year’s election and gave a special welcome to those elected to Council for the first time.

**New Councillors:** Sarah Bernier, Derek Burleton (not attending), James J. Chew, Geoff Cole, David J. Cook, Kathleen Cowick, Jim Elson, Winter Fedyk, Lee-Anne Hermann, Annie Hillock, Colin R. Lynch, Dawn K. Robertson, Phil Sager, Nicole Tuzi, D. Alan Whyte and Thomas Woodhall

**Returning Councillors:** Carol Yuen
5. **Election to the Board of Trustees Results**

The Chancellor announced that B. Mitchell and I. van Nostrand were re-elected to the Board of Trustees by University Council.

6. **Presentation of the Academic Planning Process by Dr. Daniel Woolf, Principal and Vice-Chancellor**


Principal Woolf welcomed everyone and acknowledged the value on Council’s contribution. He cited Council’s support of sustainability at its 2008 meeting, moving Queen’s toward its goal of becoming a leader in the sustainability movement. Queen’s has signed provincial, national, and international agreements pledging a commitment to sustainability. Recently the University committed to phase out the sale and use of bottled water on campus. Queen’s also has plans to install solar panels on several of its buildings.

The theme of this year’s Council meeting is Academic Planning; an important exercise that will set the course of Queen’s for the next several years. The Academic Plan is a guide – it will contain goals and provide direction. It is not a financial plan and is not intended to dictate terms to University constituencies. The plan will not be static; its goals and progress toward them will be revisited regularly and adjusted as part of ongoing planning processes.

The first step towards the integration of the academic plan into other areas of decision making was the establishment of the Queen’s University Planning Committee (QUPC) (approved by Senate April 22, 2010 and ratified by the Board of Trustees on April 30, 2010). The QUPC will play a central role in integrated University planning and will provide a vital partnership between the Board of Trustees, Senate and the Council.

The academic planning process started in January 2010 with the release of the Principal’s vision document, “Where Next? Toward a University Academic Plan.” The Principal’s vision for Queen’s is to pursue wisdom and knowledge for the greater good of our communities and the world, while inspiring outstanding achievement in learning, personal development and public service. Within that vision, Principal Woolf outlined four fundamental principles Queen’s needs to build on to distinguish itself from other research-intensive institutions:

1. Teaching and research balance
2. Innovation
3. Interdisciplinarity
4. Internationalization

Principal Woolf observed that a fifth component, imagination, should be a major intellectual tool to be taken on the journey. He encouraged councillors to be imaginative in their discussions.

The Principal outlined 10 proposals for consideration during the academic planning process.

1. Degree structure
2. Interdisciplinarity
3. Virtualization, size and flexibility
4. Field studies
5. Inquiry  
6. Areas of research excellence  
7. Connecting teaching and research  
8. Nothing is forever  
9. Creating social spaces and having conversations  

The pillars of teaching and research need to be mutually reinforced.

The timeline for academic planning is as follows:
- January-April 2010: initial input collected.
- March 10: Academic Writing team appointed. The six members of faculty, selected as leaders in areas of teaching and research, will prepare discussion papers for comment, and will continue to solicit input from the University community.
- September-December: release of a Draft Academic Plan to engage the University community in consultation and discussion.

The Principal stressed that the process is not about what to cut, but rather what is valued by the institution.

[Secretary’s note: In June 2010, the Principal announced that the timeline for developing and finalizing the University’s Academic Plan has expanded into 2011 to promote wide discussion and consultation over the fall and winter terms. The report of the Academic Writing Team (Imagining the Future: Towards an Academic Plan for Queen’s University [http://www.queensu.ca/awt/index/Imagining_the_Future_2010-08-23.pdf]) will be used as the basis for a Senate Task Force charged with drafting the Academic Plan [http://www.queensu.ca/saptf/]. At the September 23 Senate meeting, development the Academic Plan was officially referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Development. A summary of the group discussions from University Council was provided to the committee. The Task Force is expected to produce a draft plan by April 2011.]

The Principal outlined four potential institutional priorities from his vision document:
1. Energy and the Environment  
2. International Development  
3. Canadian Public Service  
4. Global Human Health

Councillors were asked to identify components that are core to the fabric of the University and must be supported regardless of funding challenges.

7. Small Group Sessions

Councillors proceeded to Kingston Hall to participate in small group discussions on topics based on the Four Institutional Principles, 10 Proposals and Possible Institutional Priorities – the three key areas of “Where Next? Toward a University Academic Plan.” The 10 groups each appointed a chair and a note-taker. Groups were provided with a laptop and USB key to record proceedings. After returning to Ellis Hall, the Chancellor welcomed everyone back and thanked the recorders of each of the breakout groups. Their input was provided to the Academic Writing Team and is attached as:
8. **Annual Report of the Queen’s University Alumni Association (QUAA)**

The Chancellor invited QUAA President H. Black to respond to questions on her “Report to University Council: Priorities and Progress,” circulated prior to the meeting, and other alumni activities. Ms. Black said that this was her first Council meeting. She noted the following:

- the launch of the Alumni Card rewards program and encouraged members to apply.
- MiniU will take place on campus on May 28 to coincide with Spring Reunion. To date, 200 people had registered for MiniU and more than 400 former graduates have registered for Spring Reunion.
- The Principal’s is committed to reviewing fall Homecoming. In the interim, fall Homecoming will be replaced by a Spring Reunion. The first Spring Reunion in 2009 was organized quickly, however, this Spring Reunion has been planned over a year and Queen’s will welcome back more than 47 classes. H. Black explained that a Spring Reunion in partnership with MiniU would continue regardless of the plans for fall Homecoming in the future.

In response to a question, Principal Woolf noted that the successful Spring Reunion would continue and that the unsanctioned Aberdeen Street party that takes place on the former fall Homecoming Weekend must cease before fall Homecoming is reconsidered.

Ms. Black also noted that:

- QUAA plans to use social media to its advantage in order to harness opportunities for like-minded people to meet and engage socially.
- Gifts from alumni total more than $7.87 million to date (April 2010); particularly gratifying considering the University community is rebounding from an economic crisis.

VP (Advancement) T. Harris said that 10 per cent of alumni give to Queen’s financially and that this 10 per cent provides many improvements to Queen’s. He impressed upon councillors that an increase in the number of alumni who give would bring immense benefits to the teaching and learning environment.

Ms. Black looked forward to seeing 100 per cent giving from University Council members and challenged them to consider making annual giving a priority.

Chancellor Dodge thanked Ms. Black for her work with the Alumni Association and her participation in the day’s activities.

9. **Council Representatives to the Board of Trustees Report**

The question-and-answer period dealt specifically with the report that was posted on the meeting website. Information related to changes in Board governance approved by Trustees on April 30 was discussed during the panel discussion on general and specific governance issues. (See #10 below.)

The Chancellor invited the Trustees elected by University Council – J. Hart, J. Lougheed, D. Masotti, B. Mitchell and I. van Nostrand – to the podium to take questions.

Mr. van Nostrand observed that the year’s annual giving had increased by 80 per cent from the same time in 2009, and praised the efforts of the Office of Advancement. He noted that the Board had four areas of focus:
1. Fiduciary responsibilities
2. Support and engagement with the Principal as he builds his team and formulates priorities for the future
3. Ongoing efforts to get the University’s financial house in order
4. A significant Board governance review

In response to questions, the following was noted:

- The University is facing a 15 per cent budget cut and all departments are under stress. The University continues to work within these constraints to hire and retain the best faculty.
- The University has unfunded liability in its Pension Plan. The Finance Committee and the Board have made this a priority. See report from VP (Finance and Administration) C. Davis, page 14, h.
- On a positive note, management of the university finances is now stronger, thanks to the efforts of former Principal Williams and to Principal Woolf. The Chancellor thanked the Trustees for their hard work and tremendous contributions to the University.

10. Report of the University Council Governance Task Force

Principal Woolf stated that over the past several years, the University Council and the Board of Trustees have discussed the roles of the University’s governing bodies. Since governance issues cannot be addressed effectively in a piecemeal fashion, reviewing the composition of the Board and Council is important. The Senate Operations Review Committee will address Senate composition and its role in governance this fall. Two governance changes effective May 1, 2010 are:

1. The appointment of an interim Provost and Vice Principal (Academic). A national search for the permanent Provost and Vice Principal (Academic) will take place over the next year.
2. The establishment of a Queen’s University Planning Committee (QUPC) to expand the link between the Board of Trustees and the Senate. The committee’s mandate is to consider and comment on financial and academic planning.

Panel Discussion of General Governance Issues
Board of Trustees Governance Review: The Chancellor invited Board Chair W. Young to the podium to address councillors on changes to the Board of Trustees and the implications for Council (Appendix C). Based on the work of the Board of the Trustees’ Governance Working Group (GWG) and the Board’s discussion on March 5, the following motions were proposed and passed at the Board meeting of April 30, 2010:

Motion 1:
That the Board of Trustees of Queen’s University ask the Parliament of Canada to approve amendments to the Charter of Queen’s University to give the Board of Trustees and the University Council responsibility for their size and composition.
Motion 2:
That the Board of Trustees approve in principle a reduction from 44 to 25 Trustees, subject to the following:

- Dialogue with the University Council;
- Consultation;
- Development of an implementation plan to achieve the approved reduction, including the route through Parliament for the necessary Charter changes;
- Review of effectiveness after a specified period.

The goal is to develop a more engaged Board, a more effective integration of key issues, a higher degree of Board satisfaction, and a more focused role for Council in the governance of Queen’s.

Dr. W. McLatchie, chair of the University Council Governance Task Force, introduced the Task Force’s report (Appendix D). He noted that Council has not changed in keeping with the new structural and financial developments that have taken place at the university. In writing its report, the Task Force worked within the confines of the current Charter and the University Council By-Laws as the proposed changes to the Board and the potential opening of the Charter were unknown factors during Task Force deliberations (January-March 2010).

Councillors continue to be concerned about the lack of opportunities for engagement other than at the annual meeting. The Task Force recommended the establishment of a Program Committee for the annual Council meeting to include some elected members of Council. This committee, which would have to be approved by the University Council Executive Committee, would provide an opportunity to revitalize Council and give it a clearer role in the governance of Queen’s. Other suggestions made by the Task Force could follow in conjunction with the other activities over the next year. Dr. McLatchie noted that it is important to involve Council members other than those on the Executive Committee. It was suggested that sub-committees could be created to work on specific issues.

The Chancellor thanked the two presenters for their governance reports and noted that University Council has many exciting initiatives to work on over the next year. In his view, the Council could become a more important body in the governance of the University.

Councillor D. Tisch congratulated Dr. McLatchie on the report and the engagement plan for University Council. He noted that the plan should include an objective and a measurable outcome.

It was noted that Council needs engaged student representation so students could provide current and relevant feedback on their university experience. Councillor N. Day (Rector) cited the importance of having representation of diverse groups on Council, and that it is important to have student councillors involved on the Program Committee.

Councillor D. Reid (Senate) noted that in the proposal to reduce the size of the Board, appointees would constitute 40 per cent of the Board. He inquired what alternatives were considered and rejected. The Chancellor invited Councillor K. Macmillan (Trustee), Chair of the GWG, to answer. The GWG examined peer institutions and other not-for-profit organizations. Many of these boards had only 22 per cent of internally appointed directors. However, the GWG also noted that the Queen’s Board of Trustees is not a corporate board. Queen’s does not have shareholders, but rather an engaged group of stakeholders. This must be considered when addressing Board composition. The Board was also aware that if the composition of the Board is
comprised of internal representation beyond a certain point, it risks losing its effectiveness. Based on the survey and discussion, trustees felt that addressing the size and composition of the Board was a priority and the time was right to move ahead with the initiative. This matter has been brought to Council because it requires a Charter change. It is necessary to have the support of University Council to open the Charter in Parliament.

Council questioned the panel about how a reducing the size of the Board might affect the democratic process. Councillor Macmillan noted that the Board is looking at mechanisms for creating a balanced structure that would allow for input from all constituencies. As a fiduciary body, a smaller board must be populated with competent, skilled people. The Board must address the issue of diversity in its membership. During the transition period, this may not be always possible, but the goal is to create a balance over time.

In response to a concern that Queen’s Theological College would no longer have representation on a smaller Board of Trustees, Councillor G. Lavery (Trustee), representing the Theological College, was invited to speak to the issue. He said that the College recognizes the need for creative and productive changes as institutions evolve over time. The Theological College had itself undergone a significant change with the establishment of the Queen’s School of Religion. Theology’s Board of Management has also recently examined its Governance and Royal Charter and made the necessary changes to move ahead as an institution. The rationale for reducing the number of their Board of Management members was much the same as the Board of Trustees. Although Theology will miss having a seat at the Board, the constant desire has been that Queen’s University continue to thrive as a great Canadian university, of which it is proud to be a part.

Councillor R. Pritchard (QUAA VP) suggested that the University Council Executive Committee work with the local Alumni Association branch to explore opportunities to collaborate.

It was observed that the implementation strategy of letting terms run out for current Trustees might not meet the competency or equity requirements of the Board. It was suggested that special care be taken to have a mechanism in place to ensure that the core competencies and diversity needs are met during the transition period. Councillor J. Curtis of the McLatchie Task Force noted that this would be a good reason to incorporate subject committees or small task forces during the transition period.

Chancellor Dodge stated that decisions on the Task Force suggestions would be addressed in the afternoon session.

The Chancellor thanked councillors for their interest and discussion of the new composition of the Board of Trustees and the panel members for their participation.

11. Principal’s State of the University Address
The Chancellor welcomed councillors to the afternoon plenary session in Ellis Auditorium and invited Principal Woolf to the podium to deliver his State of the University Address.

At the conclusion of the Principal’s address, the Chancellor introduced the panel for the Question-and-Answer session with councillors: Vice- Principals Kerry Rowe (Research), Patrick Deane (Academic), Rod Morrison (Human Resources), Tom Harris (Advancement), and Caroline Davis (Finance and Administration). A number of issues were addressed by the Vice-Principals:
a) **Advancement Initiatives:** Dr. Harris noted that the current Queen’s alumni participation rate of 10% is well below that of private schools in the United States, but on par with other Canadian universities. The rate of donation may be due to the ongoing perception that, as a publicly funded institution, fundraising is “just an extra.” Queen’s must urge donors to see how donations can make a difference. Advancement will continue to focus on increasing the number of persons giving, through social media, the internet and branding the Queen’s name. Queen’s needs to bring in $1.5 to $2 million per week; currently it is closer to $1 million. Dr. Harris said his portfolio has one of most easily measurable levels of achievement. For example, next year’s Annual Giving goal is $60M. Advancement will also be preparing for a new Capital Campaign. The success of both will be very easily measured. Council members said it would be helpful to have information regarding University Councillor giving trends presented at the next meeting.

b) **Fraternities:** Councillor K. Williamson referenced media reports about fraternities on campus and said that she understood that this was an illegal activity. In her view, the University Administration should support the AMS by publicizing that this is not acceptable. The spirit of the university community is extraordinary and the establishment of fraternities splits the loyalty between the University (AMS) and the fraternity. Dr. Deane stated that if a fraternity or sorority is operating off-campus, the University cannot interfere in the public realm. The University supports the AMS and encourages the student body to do so as well. Principal Woolf stated that one of the groups is known to him and it was his understanding that the AMS agreed to their presence and association with Queen’s undergraduates. The definition of what is or is not a fraternity is part of the equation and it is understood that the Secretary of the University and the University Lawyer have indeed determined there is an agreement between the AMS and this group to allow them to operate as a sanctioned off-campus group.

c) **Vanier Cup win:** Significant sporting events such as the Vanier Cup win have a potential effect on philanthropy. Dr. Harris noted that Marketing and Communications tracks Queen’s in the news, and the Vanier Cup had a relatively small coverage outside the local area and the Queen’s community. Gaels quarterback Danny Brannagan signed the last letter to alumni asking for donations. Alumni supported the athletic programs, e.g. purchasing championship rings for the Gaels football players. Although there is no hard evidence that the Vanier Cup win produced immediate goodwill toward Queen’s, there was an increase in donations, but this could have also been an effect of the recession recovery.

d) **Diversity:** Councillors asked what Queen’s has been doing to encourage diversity and make Queen’s more welcoming. Dr. Deane said progress has been made toward the goal and that there is still work to do. Diversity in the University’s population and curriculum has been a big issue for students and the administration. A first step was to appoint a Director of Equity and Diversity Projects, Adnan Husain, in the Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic). A Diversity Task Force has been established to assess the various diversity and equity reports tabled at Queen’s in the last two decades, as well as to determine the present status of the recommendations from those reports. The Diversity Task Force also will recommend measures to be developed and proposed for insuring accountability and for integrating diversity and equity more fully into the governance and structure of university decision-making.
e) **The Academic Plan:**

- **VP (Academic) Deane:** The plan has huge implications in the academic faculties and well as the broader University community. A strategic plan can have different impacts and the process of adjustment is key in the success of the plan. There will be a period of self-assessment and then a determination of how each unit works within the new Academic Plan.

- **VP (Advancement) Harris:** The non-academic faculties also put a plan together in tandem with the Academic Plan. Part of this plan includes marketing and communications strategy and, in particular, defining who we are, who do we want to be; essentially branding Queen’s. In fundraising, there are often unrealistic expectations about what can be achieved. It must be clear that Advancement does not set giving priorities; this is an exercise done in conjunction with the constituencies of the University.

- **VP (Human Resources) Morrison:** Currently, most of the Human Resources Department activities are focused on union activities. Human Resources is currently reorganizing to increase efficiency and to encourage a customer-centric approach and be more proactive. Examples include developing specific steps and actions to embed in recruiting practices, which create diversity and strategic hiring practices in the University.

- **VP (Research) Rowe:** There is a need to review the strategic research plan developed in 2002 and evaluate it based on the new Academic Plan. Regardless of the priorities, services need to be provided to the university community and 80 per cent of the Office of Research Services time deals with accountability and providing funding and regulatory bodies with the necessary reports and accounting for funding. Further strengthening the link between the research and teaching components of the university is another goal. Evidence shows that Queen’s star researchers are also star teachers and the Office of Research Services will continue to encourage this valuable relationship on Campus.

- **VP (Finance and Administration) Davis:** It is necessary for non-academic units to respond to Academic Planning in an integrated approach. For example, the Aboriginal Council drew people together to provide input into the plan. The Office of the VP (Finance and Administration) supports the initiatives of the university. For example, Information Technology Services through developing technologies can assist the University as it moves forward. It is also extremely important to improve the way that Queen’s manages it strategic procurement. The Queen’s University Administration Systems Replacement project (QUASR), when fully implemented, will give the Queen’s community better information for planning and accountability. When the Academic Plan is completed, the next step for the VP (Finance and Administration) would be to assess how and whether the campus should expand to meet the needs the Plan defines.

In the question and answer period following these presentations, a number of issues were discussed:

f) **Law Library:** In response to a question on the future of the Law Library, it was noted that it is part of the Law School accreditation to maintain a library, so there are no plans for it to close. Dean W. Flanagan is working with the central library system and has recently signed an agreement with the Queen’s Library System regarding staff issues in the Law Library.
g) **Queen’s outreach:** Councillor M. Peat said that internationally, Queen’s is seen as a leader in promoting opportunities for disadvantaged children. For example, Queen’s signed an agreement with L’Hart Studio, an organization for developmentally challenged people, which permits them to audit Queen’s classes. This is one example of how to promote the human rights of those who are less privileged. Outgoing Vice-Principal (Academic) Patrick Deane was thanked for promoting this agency and signing a memorandum of understanding for this initiative.

h) **Queen’s Pension Fund:** Vice-Principal (Finance and Administration) Davis reiterated that University has a solvency pension deficit projected at $240 million which, under current legislation, is required to be made up over 5 years. As well, there is a pension fund deficit of $186 million, which must be managed over a 15-year period. Many universities have the same problem and the Government may respond with a model that adds flexibility in how these liabilities are calculated and repaid. As it currently stands, the liabilities in the plan exceed the assets and this is unsustainable. When the contributions to the pension plan do not make up for this situation, the university is forced to make up the difference. There may need to be changes to the plan, but at this point Queen’s is not anticipating switching to a defined contribution plan. Without a plan and some relief, the University may be under deficit budget planning for the next several years. It is important to note that the pensions for faculty and staff are secure; the issue is the fundability. Under the current calculation the impact on the budget is that $25 million (in unfunded liability) must start to be paid in 2012, this would increase to $38 million on an ongoing basis. This type of cost would have a devastating effect on all universities. Collective bargaining may alleviate some of these concerns.

i) **Building for the future:** Principal Woolf noted that the university has a duty is to its past, but it should not be imprisoned by it. It also has a duty to the staff, a duty to the future students, parents, and alumni. Consequently, it must a long view to appropriate allocation of resources and protecting itself while not starving in the present. It is difficult to know what the long term future will hold; the University has urgent needs that must be addressed. As for younger alumni, it is not so important how much one can give but rather how frequently one is able to do so. With 100,000 alumni, if each person gave just $10, the resulting $1 million dollars to perform maintenance, hire additional graduate students, provide scholarships and ultimately contribute to every area of need in the University. When Queen’s students receive their degree, they begin a new relationship with Queen’s that the University must to foster and maintain.

At the close of these discussions, Chancellor Dodge invited the Principal to give closing remarks. Principal Woolf said that, in visiting the different breakout groups, he observed councillors having an exciting set of discussions. The themes discussed by the breakout groups were in keeping with the Where Next? document.

- The relationship between teaching and research;
- The size of Queen’s;
- Leadership and Queen’s role in creating leaders.

Principal Woolf said that although Queen’s continues to have a strong reputation, the university community has undervalued it in recent years. We need to boldly project this aspect of Queen’s. For example, Queen’s celebrated the Vanier Cup win and other athletic achievements during the past academic year; it has exceptionally high admission standards and boasts a student retention rate ranging between 94 and 98 per cent (year over year). Critical engagement of students with professors, with each other, and with alumni is vital to Queen’s success. The-out-of-class...
experience has been mentioned as a distinct feature of a Queen’s education. Queen’s regularly does well in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Queen’s has both high student satisfaction and high levels of research funding. This needs to continue. Diversity has to be part of student recruitment, but curricular diversity is also important. Much of Queen’s curriculum is Eurocentric and must be diversified. The University needs to continue to work toward:

- making campus more welcoming
- promoting the relevance of research to society
- protecting basic research in the sciences and the arts and balancing this with solving of immediate problems
- improving tracking and documentation of co-curricular activities to create a co-curricular transcript.

Queen’s must make choices. In competing for grants and the best students, we do not want to emulate other universities. The measure of success is not just for the University or Faculty, but for the individual student.

Principal Woolf said he looked forward to receiving the notes from the councillors’ breakout sessions as contributions to the academic planning process.

12. Chancellor’s Closing Remarks

Chancellor Dodge thanked panel members and the Principal for his closing remarks. The Chancellor also thanked the members of the University Secretariat for the excellent preparation for the day.

The Chancellor noted that the University must move ahead to prepare a private members’ bill to be presented to Parliament, based on the proposal to reduce the size of the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor recommended that the University Council Executive Committee, along with the six trustees elected by the University Council, work together over the summer to prepare the request to Parliament. The Chancellor recommended the wording changes to the Charter be voted on by Council in October. Council’s agreement was also sought in examining the composition and mandate of University Council this fall. The Executive Committee will also consider a formal motion to establish a Program Planning Committee as recommended by the Task Force on Governance chaired by Dr. McLatchie.

A councillor observed that the role of the Council Executive Committee overlaps that of the proposed Program Planning Committee and recommended that the program planning for University Council be added to the mandate of the Executive Committee. It was further suggested that three more councillors be added to Executive Committee to assist with program planning. Chancellor Dodge observed that there was no need to address the specific logistics of committee changes; the focus should be on the importance of Queen’s to have “home rule” and how that will affect its overall governance structure. The mechanics do not have to be addressed at this point, but they will have to be addressed in the near future. Parliament will be asked to delete the particularities of composition, not the powers of the governing bodies.

It was suggested that the McLatchie Task Force on Governance mandate may have been too narrow and whether the governance structure at Queen’s be further addressed. The Chancellor suggested that the tri-cameral nature of Queen’s could change over time. The goal is not to eliminate the structure, but instead make it more seamless and transparent in its function.
Councillors ask that that it be recorded in the minutes that the Report of the Task Force on Governance was excellent. The report forms the basis of an engagement plan for councillors in the life of Queen’s University.

Next steps: The University will now consider the changes recommended by the Board of Trustees and bring the final result and plan to University Council for ratification in the fall.

13. **Adjournment**

Chancellor Dodge thanked the organizers, participants and councillors for an excellent Annual Meeting and for their continuing support to Queen’s University.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.