Minutes

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Friday, December 1, 2006, 7:00p.m. Policy Studies, Conference Room

Members Present: Principal and Vice-Chancellor, Karen R. Hitchcock
The Chancellor, Charles Baillie
The Chair, William Young
The Rector, Johsa Manzanilla

Toby Abramsky, George Anderson, Kimberly Bain, Beverley Baines, Curtis Bartlett, Peter Baxter, Donald Bayne, Kim Black, Louise Cannon, Kingsley Chak, Jeff Chan, Hugh Christie, Donald Cooper, Merv Daub, Graham Davis, Sarah Jane Dumbrille, Jocelyn Hart, George Lavery, Anne Leahy, Heino Lilles, Lindsey Love-Forester, Dean McKeown, Susan Miklas, Bruce Mitchell, Tom O’Neill, Barbara Palk, David Pattenden, Andrew Pipe, Kent Plumley, David Whiting

I OPENING SESSION

1. Opening of the Meeting
The Chair welcomed everyone.

Lee Tierney – Twenty years of service to the Board
The Chair spoke in recognition of Lee Tierney’s twenty years of service to the Board of Trustees, noting that this spanned the terms of three chancellors, three principals, five board chairs, three secretaries and eleven rectors. The Chair warmly thanked Mrs. Tierney for her thorough, consistent and reliable support for the work of the Board and presented her with a bouquet.

2. Adoption of the Agenda
The Agenda was adopted as circulated (Hitchcock/Leahy).

Carried 06-44

3. Adoption of the Minutes of September 29/30 and November 7, 2006 (Appendix A, page 1)
The Minutes of September 29/30 and of November 7, 2006 were approved as circulated (Hitchcock/ Pipe).

Carried 06-45

4. Business Arising from the Minutes
The Chair referred to the topic of personal safety raised by the Environmental Health and Safety Committee at the September meeting. He assured Trustees that this matter was under review with respect to where the mandate for oversight resided among the standing committees of the Board.

5. Opening Remarks by the Chair

a) Pension Plan Update
The Chair reported that the review of the Pension Plan continued and noted that the issues to be addressed had been caused mainly by exogenous environmental factors. He explained that the following Trustees and former Trustees, who are not members of the Plan but who have the
relevant expertise, met recently to discuss the possible solutions: C. Baillie, H. Christie, G. Hall, B. Palk, and W. Young. Possible amendments have been identified and will be reviewed collectively and considerately as the Administration engages in discussion with employee groups in the near future. The Principal added that she was very pleased with the progress on these difficult issues.

b) Board Agenda
The Chair remarked that he planned to look at the current agenda format with a view to making improvements. He invited Trustees to submit their thoughts to him.

c) Congratulations and Acknowledgements
The Chair recognized the following:

- **David Whiting – 2006 John Orr Award** recipient presented by the Toronto Alumni Branch on November 18, 2006.
- **Donald Bayne – 2006 G. Arthur Martin Criminal Justice Award** recipient for outstanding contributions to criminal law.
- **Donald Cooper – 2007 Queen’s Honorary Degree Recipient** at the May 24 convocation for the School of Business and the School of Policy Studies. Donald Cooper was being recognized for his outstanding volunteer contributions. The November 30 Report to the Senate announcing the recipients for the spring and fall was distributed to Trustees at the meeting.
- **George Hood – Vice-Principal (Advancement)** on his retirement at the end of December after eight years in the portfolio characterized by Vice-Principal Hood’s passion for and commitment to Queen’s University. He pointed to the outstanding success of the Campaign for Queen’s that concluded in 2003 at a total of $264M and the Pathfinder proposal for tuition sustainability as just two examples of the bold vision and drive of Vice-Principal Hood.

6. Principal’s Report
The Principal began by officially welcoming William Young to his first meeting as the Chair. She went on to speak about the contributions of Vice-Principal George Hood and the future opportunities to celebrate the “Hood Years.”

a) Introductions
The Principal introduced the following new members of the senior administrative staff:

Anne Brown – Associate Vice-Principal (Facilities)
Jim Vair – Associate Vice-Principal (Faculty Relations)
Greg Lessard – Special Advisor to the Principal (Professor of French Studies, Computing and Language and Linguistics)

b) Search Committees
The process to identify the next Dean of Applied Science continues. A search will be initiated for the next Vice-Principal (Advancement).

c) Reports provided for information
- Final Report on Admissions and Enrolment (Appendix B, page 23)
- University Annual Report for 2006 (final version enclosed with the Agenda)
- Report on the 2006/07 Annual Budget (distributed at the meeting)
d) **Dedication Opportunity** (Appendix C, page 40)

Moved by K. Hitchcock  
Seconded by A. Pipe and agreed:

That the Board of Trustees approve the dedication of Seminar Room 127 in the Centre for Health Electronic Education Resources (CHEER) in the Bracken Health Sciences Library in recognition of the gift of an anonymous donor, in memory of Bill Ersil and Don Briggs, Class of Meds ’79.

Carried 06-46

e) **Analysis of 2006 University Rankings**

The Principal provided an overview and analysis of university rankings and evaluations conducted in 2006:

**Canada:**

Maclean’s University Rankings – is in its fourteenth year but in 2006 conducted without the participation of more than 20 universities including Queen’s. Maclean’s relied instead on some third party and public data sources, and on last year’s university submissions.


Globe and Mail University Navigator – is a new web-based tool that allows users to “evaluate” universities (by cluster, not rank) using criteria based on the Report Card survey and on third party and public financial, scholarship, bibliometric and research data sources.

Research Infosource – documents total research income and publications by Canadian universities.

**Canada/US:**

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) – a student survey that measures student activity and institutional practice in numerous areas that are known to be associated with positive learning and personal development outcomes. This is an effort to define areas for quality improvement not a ranking exercise. This year it includes all Ontario universities, a dozen other Canadian universities and over five hundred US universities.

**International:**

Times Higher Education World University Rankings – an international ranking of universities based on reputation, research and resources (e.g. student:faculty ratio).

Shanghai Jiao Tong University Rankings of World Universities – an exclusively research-based international ranking driven by the number of Nobel prizes, citations and publications.
Each of the exercises deals with a limited set of issues as outlined in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of the Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclean’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;M Report Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;M Navigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Infosource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Higher Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International rankings focus on research and are implicitly dependent on levels of institutional resources; such rankings exclude student satisfaction issues. Queen’s is one of only a few universities that scores well on both research/reputation and student experience/engagement measures: most institutions that perform well on one, score much lower on the other. Despite the authoritative “aura” of the rankings, they are subject to substantial data integrity and consistency problems. The NESSE is the exception. Overall, rankings assume that “one size fits all.” They ignore mission differences and average across very different elements of the institution.

Analyzing the results of all the rankings and survey exercises, Queen’s overall strengths are reflected in moderate to high research intensity (7th in Canada) plus a high level of student engagement and satisfaction (1st on University Report Card). The research performance reported for Queen’s is quite exceptional given its medium size and the resources available compared to other major international universities. The Principal noted that the theme session on Saturday, December 2, would explore some of the research programs at Queen’s in more depth. She continued with a closer look at the surveys focusing on teaching and student satisfaction.

The NSSE survey indicates that Queen’s has strengths in library resources, teaching quality and student services. However, both NSSE and the University Report Card indicate a number of areas for improvement including student/faculty interaction, class size, diversity and sports facilities. The results in the latter category, reinforce the extremely high priority placed on the Queen’s Centre and the Stadium and Fields projects.

Queen’s has already addressed, and will continue to address, many areas in order to maintain/improve quality and competitiveness. These are:

- Faculty re-investment to improve student-faculty interaction, course/curriculum enhancements
- Learning Commons to foster collaborative learning
• Gordon Hall for integrated service provision
• Queen’s Centre to develop social/recreational activity, enhanced learning environment
• School of Population and Public Health to aid research and graduate growth
• Needs- and merit-based student support to increase student quality and diversity

Notwithstanding the methodological flaws in a number of the ranking exercises, the results of these rankings and the student surveys provide a general overview of quality at Queen’s, and limited comparisons to other universities.

It is important to note that Queen’s decision to stop participating in the MacLean’s Ranking exercise because of methodological flaws does not represent a lack of commitment to accountability or transparency. Indeed, Queen’s continues to participate in a number of surveys which provide more useful information to the University as well as prospective students. Along with seventeen other Ontario universities Queen’s has developed an on-line tool which enables users to access and compare information in many key areas. CUDO, or Common University Data Ontario, was recently launched and provides a robust information resource for parents and prospective students.

During discussion it was noted that the Times Higher Education World University Rankings was a survey of faculty and job recruiters, a source of information that was not common to other surveys.

With respect to food service issues, on the whole the food at Queen’s is considered good. The Associate Vice-Principal and Dean of Student Affairs added that, since the rankings were conducted, dining facilities at Queen’s have been upgraded and there have been modifications to the food plan options.

7. Report on Senate Actions (Appendix D, page 41)

a) Centre for Manufacturing of Advanced Ceramic and Nanomaterials – for ratification (page 43)

Moved by K. Hitchcock
Seconded by K. Black and agreed:

That the Board of Trustees ratify the decision of the Senate on September 21, 2006, to establish the Centre for Manufacturing of Advanced Ceramics and Nanomaterials, as a faculty-based research centre, for a period of five years.

Carried 06-47


There were no questions.

9. Student Affairs

a) Report of the Rector, Johsa Manzanilla

The Rector apologized for not submitting a written report and noted that she would submit a written version for inclusion in the minutes.

The Rector congratulated the Principal on the Strategic Plan and in the context of the Plan spoke about equity, sustainability and accessibility. She also spoke about issues around ethical investing being raised by a group on campus, Students Taking Action Now for Darfur (STAND). She referred to renewed efforts to ensure that orientation leader training is strengthened. She pointed to the Integrated Learning Centre Tea Room as an outstanding
example of sustainability at work. She reported that she was pursuing improvements on behalf of mobility impaired students with respect to the physical barriers to access found in many campus facilities. In this regard, the Rector had initiated discussions with the Associate Vice-Principal (Facilities) Ann Browne.

In conclusion, the Rector thanked Vice-Principal (Advancement) George Hood.

b) AMS – President, James MacMillan (Appendix F, page 50)
The President referred to his written report in the Agenda that covered areas of recent focus in the AMS including the peer run Non-Academic Discipline system, accessibility of orientation and leader training, the Kingston municipal elections and the work of the AMS Sustainability Coordinator.

In addition, he referred to the recent divestments by American “ivy league” schools to address ethical investing concerns and to the work that has begun on the governance structure of the Queen’s Centre as the construction work for the project gets underway.

In conclusion, the President paid tribute to Vice-Principal (Advancement) George Hood and thanked him for the many ways in which he has influenced the AMS directly in addition to his outstanding contributions to the University.

c) SGPS – President, Andrew Stevens (Appendix G, page 51)
The President began by speaking about a book drive to supply texts to Africa and explained that a colleague who is working for CIDA invites support for this effort from any interested individual or group.

The items reviewed in the report form the current focus for the SGPS including Paid Parental Leave for graduate students, Automatic Completion Bursaries, International Student Tuition Bursaries, UHIP Reimbursement Funds for all graduate students, permanent support for Conference Travel Awards that are currently being funded from an SGPS surplus, and the establishment of a Minimum Master’s Funding Package.

With respect to conference travel funding, Barbara Palk suggested that soliciting trustees for unused airline points might be a worthwhile course of action.

10. Strategic Plan (Appendix H, page 53)

Moved by K. Hitchcock
Seconded by J. Hart and agreed unanimously:

That the Board of Trustees approve “Engaging the World: A Strategic Plan for Queen’s University.”

Carried 06-48

The Principal’s powerpoint presentation is attached in full to these minutes.

The following aspects were explored during discussion.

Reducing the student/faculty ratio is a goal in the plan, not a performance measure. We can examine the net increase or decrease over a number of years but we need to articulate what that means in the context of enrolment changes, changes in pedagogy, etc.

Specific targets will be detailed in the annual operational plans and measured against the goals.
The plan accurately captures the “alchemy” of the place and properly gives credit to the spirit of student self-direction for which Queen’s has become known.

Trustees congratulated the Principal on introducing Queen’s first strategic plan and for its successful adoption by the Senate.

The Principal thanked the many members of the team that worked with her over the last year to bring the plan forward and particularly to all those, including trustees, who shared their thoughts and recommendations during its development at town halls, retreats, group and individual meetings, and many other communications.

11. Queen’s Centre Phase I funding (Appendix I, page 85)

In addition to the material provided in the Agenda, a report to the Board of Trustees on the Queen’s Centre, dated December 1, 2006, was circulated to all trustees at the beginning of the meeting.

The Principal introduced the topic by speaking about the pivotal nature and strategic importance of the Queen’s Centre.

Andrew Pipe, Chair of the Queen’s Centre Executive Committee, spoke about the early days of the project ten years ago and the unparalleled vision and the responsible process of consultation and decision making that had led to the beginning of Phase 1. It was clear by every measure that the current Queen’s student life facilities were “fourth rate, struggling to be third rate.” The costs of the project were more than any previous capital development at Queen’s. However, it was also clear that any level of effective remediation of the existing facilities would carry a heavy cost. After extensive analysis of the costs and the sources of funds, the conclusion had been reached that Queen’s had the ability to support the project and to mitigate the associated risks of exposure.

Andrew Simpson, Vice-Principal (Operations and Finance) spoke in agreement. He noted the complexity and the multiple teams across a range of expertise that had been brought to bear on the project development to this point. The size and risk present in all aspects of the project were very evident. However, he also noted the opportunity for Queen’s to move forward on a grand scale in an area that students consistently ranked at the lowest level. He emphasized the tremendous good fortune that the new Associate Vice-Principal (Facilities), Ann Browne, comes to Queen’s with solid experience in the construction management process that has been selected for the Queen’s Centre and he expressed complete confidence that the risks inherent in such a large project will be managed effectively. Not moving forward at this stage would, in Vice-Principal Simpson’s opinion, expose the University to potentially greater risk and challenges in mitigating the state of the current facilities.

Ann Browne, Associate Vice-Principal (Facilities), outlined for the trustees the selection process involving a RFP, an information session with seven firms, bids received from four firms and a short list of three firms. PLC was selected as the construction manager. AVP Browne commented on the very good fit between Queen’s and the team members at PLC. She referred to previous projects under PLC management, including BC Place, the Ottawa Airport, and the Canadian War Museum. She explained that Queen’s would be closely involved with every aspect and in negotiations with PLC to ensure value engineering, with the possibility that the process could change from a construction management to a stipulated bid contract.

Associate Vice-Principal and CFO, Daniel Hogg, confirmed a 5% contingency. He noted that two other options were reviewed – renovation of the current facility and scaling down the Queen’s Centre proposal - would both be more expensive in the long run.
Tom O’Neill, representing the Advancement Committee, spoke about the Queen’s Centre Project and the West Campus/Fields Project. He reported that cabinets for both fund raising campaigns had been formed. Paul Hand and Victoria Hand were the campaign chairs for the West Campus/Fields Project and would be working with cabinet members from the Board, Merv Daub and Don Bayne. With respect to fund raising for the Queen’s Centre the plan was to attract six donors to raise approximately $80M. Preliminary work indicated that there was definitely interest among donors and a $5M gift had been secured. All the elements were coming together – vision and commitment demonstrated by the students’ pledge. That was being followed by Trustees: forty percent of Trustees had been approached to date and $3M had been raised. In conclusion, Tom O’Neill spoke about the impetus the Queen’s Centre project owed to Vice-Principal Hood. On a personal level, he spoke of the friendship that he had developed with Vice-Principal Hood, that friendship would continue for a long time.

Dan Burns spoke about the work that the Campus Planning and Development Committee had contributed to date on the Queen’s Centre Project. The Committee had completed its normal process of approval a year ago for the site planning and massing, for the outside entrances and exits and for the exterior. More recently, the Committee turned its attention to the business practice required to manage such a complex project in a cost effective and timely manner. While institutions do not usually adopt a construction management approach, it seemed reasonable to explore the idea. It was concluded that construction management was the right method and Dan Burns observed that PLC is a substantial firm in this arena.

As the final committee chair to speak, George Anderson reported that the Finance Committee had covered much of the same ground with respect to the scope of the project, the costs involved and the funding options available. The consensus emerged that it was now time for Queen’s to move forward. Following discussions at the Finance Committee and the Queen’s Centre Executive Committee about the importance of developing the necessary governance model, the following revised motions were distributed at the Board meeting in place of the motion circulated with the Board Agenda. The revisions were intended to harmonize the management of the revenues and to provide an ongoing governance structure for the Queen’s Centre.

**Motion I**

Moved by G. Anderson  
Seconded by T. O’Neill and agreed  

The Finance Committee, on the advice of the Queen’s Centre Executive Committee and with the approval of the Campus Planning and Development Committee, recommends that the Board of Trustees approve an increase in funding of $115,000,000 for the construction of the Queen’s Centre Phase I.  

Carried 06-49

**Motion II**

Moved by George Anderson  
Seconded by Tom O’Neill and agreed  

The Finance Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees also request the Administration to engage with the appropriate stakeholders to ensure a governance model for the Queen’s Centre is developed and adopted that will ensure the operating plan and projected incremental revenues are realized. Administration is asked to update the Board on progress at the May 4, 2007 meeting with a goal to having an agreed governance structure for the November 30, 2007 meeting.  

Carried 06-50
The Chair acknowledged the tremendous contributions over the last ten years of a very large number of people who worked on the Queen’s Centre Project – trustees, administrators, faculty, staff and students. He said it was a transformational event for the University and the advancement of a vision, not just an athletic facility.

II REPORTS OF COMMITTEES


Tom O’Neill commented on the following items:

a) Quarterly Report
   Advancement’s accomplishments were on track according to planned objectives.

b) Marketing and Communications
   The launching of iTunesU makes Queen’s the first Canadian university to enter this joint venture with Apple.

c) Advancement Operations
   The Committee received a report on the recent review of Advancement Operations by an external consultant.

d) Alumni Relations
   Seventy-nine of the eighty-one recommendations from the Principal’s Taskforce on Alumni Relations have been acted on. Plans are in place to introduce a second Alumni Weekend at Queen’s on May 23-25, 2008. This weekend will have an educational focus.

2. Audit Committee

The Chair, Hugh Christie, reported on the following items:

a) Pension Plan Update
   The Principal presented an update on the Pension Plan issues that assured the Audit Committee that critical issues were being addressed.

b) Legislative Compliance
   The Compliance Report was presented by Diane Kelly, Legal Counsel. The report contains an inventory of 38 pieces of provincial and federal legislation and confirms that Queen’s is in compliance as required.

c) Appointment of External Auditors
   External Auditors KPMG presented its management letter concerning last year’s audit. No issues of significance were identified.

   The Committee evaluated the benefits of continuing to use KPMG, a national firm that is considered the market leader in Ontario and very highly regarded by the Queen’s management team. The goal is to strike a balance between “fresh eyes” and experience. The Quality Review Partner was changed this year to a partner from KPMG, Ottawa.
Moved by H. Christie  
Seconded by T. O’Neill and agreed:

That the Board of Trustees approve the appointment of KPMG as the External Auditor for Queen’s University for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2007.  
Carried 06-51

3. Campus Planning and Development Committee

Dan Burns, Chair of CPDC, reported on the following:

a) Residence Renewal  
As the first step in renewal program, the Committee endorsed the final plans for a $5.5M redevelopment of McNeill House.

b) Tindall Field/Parking Structure  
The Committee approved the precinct study design for the Artificial Field/Parking Structure and recommended the allocation of funding to proceed with the project to install an integrated all weather field and underground parking facility on the current location of the Mackintosh-Corry Parking Lot. The lighting for the field will be provided by six lamp standards.

c) Kingston Hall to Summerhill Walkway  
The Committee approved the design proposal for the extension of the east-west walkway between Arch Street and University Avenue, in front of Theological College and on the north side of Kingston Field.

d) Union Street Project  
The Committee endorsed the policy framework for the public space landscape and lighting.

e) Memorial Quadrangle  
The Committee heard a presentation on the concept plan to recapture the original 1919 intention for the area known as the Memorial Quadrangle between Douglas Library and Ontario Hall to the west, Union Street to the north, Fifth Field Company Lane to the east and Flemming Hall to the south.

f) Other Projects  
The Committee touched briefly on the whole building renewal project for Richardson Hall; the Botterell Hall extension; planning options developed by the School of Business for the expansion of Goodes Hall and the newly acquired property at the Tett Centre.

In response to a question, Dan Burns explained that smaller projects such as gateways and entrances to the campus were being discussed by the Grounds Subcommittee of Campus Planning and Development.

4. Environmental Health and Safety Committee

a) Annual Report from the Department of Environmental Health & Safety (Appendix K, page 102)  
Susan Miklas, Chair of the Committee, drew attention to the annual report that provides a very useful summary and overview of how the University manages its compliance in the areas of Environmental Health and Safety. Compliance requires that appropriate systems are in place throughout the operations of the institution.
b) **Policy Statement on Environmental Management** (Appendix L, page 130)

Annually, the Board is required to approve the policy statement.

Moved by S. Miklas
Seconded by G. Lavery and agreed:

That the Board of Trustees approve the Policy Statement on Environmental Management.

Carried 06-52


c) **Policy Statement on Health & Safety** (Appendix M, page 131)

Annually, the Board is required to approve the policy statement.

Moved by S. Miklas
Seconded by G. Lavery and agreed:

That the Board of Trustees approve the Policy Statement on Health and Safety.

Carried 06-53

S. Miklas noted that the University has a separate policy on Harassment and Discrimination. Revisions to this policy were last approved by the Senate and the Board of Trustees in 2000.

d) **Pandemic Planning**

S. Miklas reported that the group working on the emergency management plans has been focussing on ways to maintain essential activities of service departments and human resources, and has begun to look at effective communications between senior management and academic units. Units such as Health, Counselling and Disability Services, Residences, Food Services and Environmental Health and Safety have been reviewing strategies to address virus outbreaks.

There was a brief discussion about the challenges of caring for sick students on campus. The Kingston hospitals and the local health unit are in continuing discussions with the University on this matter.

e) **Legislation**

The Committee reviewed a list of applicable legislation: 15 provincial; 8 federal; plus municipal bylaws and international legislation governing shipping and transportation.

5. **Finance Committee**

a) **Quarterly Financial Report** (Appendix N, page 132)

George Anderson, Chair of the Committee, reported that discussion of the Queen’s Centre, the Queen’s Pension Plan and the operating budget formed the main elements of the Finance Committee agenda.
b) Capital Projects

i) Artificial Field/Parking Surface (Appendix O, page 136)

Moved by G. Anderson  
Seconded by B. Mitchell and agreed:

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee and the Campus Planning and Development Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the allocation of $34,700,000 for the construction of the Artificial Field/Parking Structure Project, and award a contract within the approved project budget, to the lowest bona fide bidders.

Carried 06-54

Moved by G. Anderson  
Seconded by A. Pipe and agreed:

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee and the Campus Planning and Development Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the allocation of $9,800,000 for the construction of underground parking facilities to be constructed as a part of the Queen’s Centre Phase 1 project.

Carried 06-55


Moved by G. Anderson  
Seconded by B. Mitchell and agreed:

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee and the Campus Planning and Development Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the allocation of $5,750,000 for redevelopment of McNeill House, funding for the project to be provided by Residence Services, and award a contract, within the approved project budget, to the lowest bonafide bidders.

Carried 06-56

6. Investment Committee (Appendix Q, page 139)

Louise Cannon, Chair of the Committee, reviewed the written report provided in the Agenda. The performance summary reflected that global equity markets had picked up in the third quarter following a second quarter slump. The Pooled Endowment Fund’s second quarter return was 4.4%, and the twelve month return of 8.3% was about 10 basis points above the benchmark for the total fund. The Investment Committee continues to review the structure of fixed income in investments and plans are in process to change a manager. The Statement of Investment Policies and Procedures (SIP&P) has been updated. Changes since 2004 are generally minor in nature. Alternative investments are being reviewed and the Committee is following recent issues that have been raised about social investing.

7. Pension Committee (Appendix R, page 147)

Bill Cannon, Chair of the Committee, reported that the Pension Fund third quarter return was 4.8% and the twelve month return was 9.1% as of September 30, 2006. The net return after two months of the new Plan year is 3.5%. The 8.9% rate of return for the plan year ending August 30, 2006, has generated an increase for most pensioners of 5.6%. The Committee decided to move some funds from Canadian equities to global equities because of the limitations of the Canadian equity market versus the opportunities, including emerging markets, in global equities. Work on Plan changes
continues. The Plan’s actuary will present the preliminary valuation results to the Pension Committee on December 7.

8. Nominating Committee

a) Report of the Chief Elections Officer (Appendix S, page 151)

Kim Black, Chair of the Committee noted that there were no issues raised in the report.

b) Board Elections

K. Black reviewed the nomination and election dates for elections by the Graduates and by the University Council to the Board of Trustees.

She noted that in 2007 the University Council trustees would be elected by the same method and in the same timeframe as the other constituencies. Her announcement prompted questions from some of the University Council trustees who had not been fully aware of this change. The Secretary explained that nominations had closed on November 30, a change from the previous timing of March 30. The change in By Law C had been adopted by the University Council in May 2006. At its meeting on October 16 the Executive Committee of the Council approved the new timeline for nominations, elections and the online method of voting. Councilors were notified by memo dated October 23. The Chancellor pointed out that if the new method did not prove satisfactory in 2007 a change could be made for the following year. Trustee Sarah-Jane Dumbrille explained that she is the Trustees’ representative on the Executive Committee of the Council and promised to look further into the questions and concerns being raised by the University Council Trustees.

The following two candidates have been acclaimed in the Benefactor category for three-year terms beginning on June 1, 2007.

Sarah Jane Dumbrille
Kathleen Ellen MacMillan

c) Henry Report

K. Black reported that the Nominating Committee had turned its attention to the Henry Report documents circulated to trustees. The Committee is mandated to pursue diversity and equity in its search for candidates to fill the 15 positions on the Board that are proposed from time to time by the Nominating Committee. The other 26 positions are filled by constituencies through elections or appointments. As a result the Nominating Committee is presented with a complex challenge to achieve a balanced blend of the necessary skill sets and range of experience within the position constraints that are also complicated by term rotations, and the personal time and other commitments of candidates. The difference in the numbers (26 versus 15) means that the Nominating Committee cannot expect to have a dominant impact on the membership as whole. The Chair of the Committee encouraged all trustees to exercise their votes as effectively as possible when they are eligible to elect trustees as Benefactors, Graduates and members of University Council in elections.
d) Amendment to the Investment Committee Constitution

Moved by K. Black
Seconded by L. Cannon and agreed:

That, on the recommendation of the Nominating Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the following proposal to amend the constitution of the Investment Committee. The current terms (published on page 30 of the Gold Book), approved by the Board of Trustees in May 1996 and amended in March 2001, are amended below to reflect the proposal (see strikethrough and bold text):

8. The Investment Committee shall:

a) Make recommendations to the Board of Trustees concerning the management of the investment funds of the University (Queen's Pooled Endowment Fund, Queen's Pooled Investment Fund, Queen's Short-term Fund) and other funds as requested by the Board of Trustees;

b) Within the statutory authority of the University, invest and, within such policies as may be established from time to time by the Board, give direction to any Investment Counsel appointed from time to time by the Board for the management of the funds;

c) Have the delegated authority from the Board of Trustees to terminate any Investment Counsel whose strategy and/or performance does not meet the objectives established by the Committee, and the delegated authority from the Board of Trustees to hire Investment Counsel to manage investment funds. Such decisions shall be communicated to the Board of Trustees at the next meeting of the Board.

d) Act in an advisory capacity when the Board of Trustees decides on the dollar amounts to be withdrawn each year from investment funds to support operations;

e) Review at regular intervals the University's investments and monitor the performance of each Investment Counsel with a view to maximizing the total return, keeping in mind the need for immediate income as well as the preservation and enhancement of the future purchasing power of the funds;

f) Supervise the safekeeping and handling of the University's investments which are under the Investment Committee's jurisdiction.

Carried 06-57

9. Closed Session

During a Closed Session the following motion was approved.

Moved by K. Black
Seconded by H. Lilles and agreed:

On the recommendation of the Nominating Committee, to appoint Jerry del Missier to the Board of Trustees for a four-year term until May 2010, effective immediately.

Carried 06-58
III THEME SESSION – SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2006 9:00 AM.

Think Research, Think Queen’s

The Board reconvened on Saturday morning for a theme session coordinated by the Vice-Principal (Research), Kerry Rowe, with presentations from:

Dr. Wendy Craig – Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network (PREV-net)
Dr. David Layzell – Queen’s Institute for Energy and Environmental Policy (QIEEP)
Dr. Art McDonald – Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (SNO)
Dr. Brant Peppley – Fuel Cell Research Centre (FCRC)
Dr. Robert Ross – Population and Public Health, Centre for Obesity Research (CORE)
Dr. John Smol – Paleoecological Environmental Assessment and Research Lab (PEARL)

A copy of the introductory presentation is attached to these minutes.