Appendix A

Minutes

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Friday, November 30 and Saturday, December 1, 2007, 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

I OPENING SESSION

Opening of the Meeting
The Chair welcomed everyone including Sarah Renaud, President of the Queen’s University Alumni Association (QUAA), attending her first Board of Trustees as an observer and new trustees David Grace and Dan Rees (formerly QUAA President).

1. Adoption of the Agenda

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

That the Board adopt the agenda as circulated with the provision that items 2 to 4 and the listed Committee Reports be approved, or received for information, by consent.

Carried 07-42

Consent


That the Board approve the minutes of September 28/29, 2007, as circulated.

Carried 07-43

Reports received for information:

Committee Reports Received for information:

- **Audit Report** (Appendix H, page 82)
- **Investment Quarterly Report** (Appendix I, page 84)
- **Pension Quarterly Report** (Appendix J, page 91)

**Regular**

9. **Business Arising from the Minutes** – none.

10. **Chair’s Report**

   **Report on Results from the Board Survey** (Appendix K, page 95)
   The Chair reviewed the summary of the results. He thanked all those who participated in the first annual survey conducted by the Queen’s Board of Trustees. He noted that, minus new trustees, seventy-five percent participated. Overall the survey responses identified the following as the most important issues:
   
   - The process for capital project planning should be further developed and refined.
   - The pros and cons of a Human Resources committee of the Board should be explored.
   - The Saturday morning Theme Session should be used sometimes to explore issues of strategic importance.

   T. O’Neill congratulated the Chair on the first survey, thanked him for the opportunity to participate and supported a focus on two or three items to improve the effectiveness of the Board of Trustees going forward.

**Queen’s Pension Plan**

The Chair spoke to the Pension Plan with reference to the materials circulated to Trustees on Thursday, November 29, 2007, about the review of the governance structure of the Pension Plan by the Board of Trustees.

The Chair reminded Trustees that at the May 5, 2007, meeting he had spoken about the view broadly held within the Board of Trustees that a governance review was necessary. He felt it useful to clarify once again the context in which the review is being undertaken, where the University is in the process and what to expect going forward.

The governance review is predicated on three issues:

1. The rapid evolution of community standards around governance in general and particularly with respect to pension plan governance. Pension industry standards for both public and private plans have changed.

2. The Queen’s Pension Plan has remained the same for thirty years. The demographics of the plan membership have shifted substantially. There are now more retirees than active members and the Plan pays out more in benefits than it collects in contributions. This is offset partly by the Plan investment income. With this dynamic, the Board must think carefully about the sustainability of the Plan.

3. The Plan is in deficit.
The Board of Trustees has responsibility to the institution to deal with these issues in a serious and straightforward manner.

The process thus far has been to establish a Taskforce comprised of Barbara Palk, George Anderson, Rod Morrison and Andrew Simpson. Bill Cannon, Chair of the Pension Committee, was consulted as were others. Such consultation will be ongoing. The Taskforce received legal advice from Elizabeth Brown who has a thorough understanding of plan amendments and the governance structures being developed. She is also providing advice on legal compliance with pension regulations.

John Holmes raised concerns that this was a behind the scenes process. However, Draft 1 of the materials became available on November 29 and has now been circulated to all Trustees. It will also be available to employee groups so we can enter into a consultation over the next months about the effect of the proposed changes and enhancements.

In September, Bill Cannon indicated his intention to resign as a member and as Chair of the Pension Committee after a long tenure. This decision has exacerbated concerns among employee groups. The Chair thanked Bill Cannon for his willingness to continue as Chair of the Pension Committee during the governance review.

The Chair stressed that the Board continue to be open about the rationale for a governance review of the Pension Plan and indicated that the Board will engage in a major discussion of this topic in March.

The Chair concluded his comments with the following summary:

1. The Queen’s Pension Plan is a major benefit for employees.
2. The Board of Trustees must balance its fiduciary responsibility to the institution and its responsibility to employees.
3. The Plan design engineered thirty years ago is not responding well to the current environment and this has resulted in the rapidly growing deficit. The Board and the employee groups must work on these complex issues in a collaborative manner to make the necessary evolutionary steps to ensure that the Plan is sustainable in the long term.

John Holmes noted that the letter dated November 26 to the Chair of the Board was signed by the presidents of all the employee groups: CUPE Local 254, Local 229, Local 1302, QUSA and QUFA. All employee groups were collectively moved to register their concerns. He stated that for two years the employee groups have been discussing changes that could be made to the Plan. When Bill Cannon tendered his resignation at the end of September and made reference in his letter to governance issues, the groups became concerned. They felt that they had been tackling the possible changes in good faith, only to discover that the Board was taking legal advice on governance issues which might result in a significant shift in the administration of the Plan.

11. Principal’s Report

The Principal began her report by welcoming everyone and thanking the many Trustees who had provided invaluable input on a number of ongoing initiatives and particular challenges faced by Queen’s.

Diversity and Equity at Queen’s

The Principal referred to the University’s commitment to diversity that is woven throughout many of its documents and forms an integral part of the Strategic Plan. She said it was imperative that the University move forward from these verbal and written commitments to concrete actions.
The appointment of Dr. Barrington Walker as Diversity Advisor to the Vice-Principal (Academic) is one such action. A scholar in the area of Black Canadian history and the histories of race and immigration in Canada, Dr. Walker will lead and support informed consideration and advancement of issues of race, ethnicity and diversity across all aspects of academic life at Queen’s including curriculum development, stimulating discussion and debate, and advice on accessibility and inclusiveness. He will work with all the members of the Queen’s community toward our shared goals regarding diversity and the elimination of prejudice.

Dr. Walker’s appointment as of November 1 preceded by only two weeks, an alarming incident of apparent racism and intimidation at Queen’s.

A female member of the faculty reported that she was forced from a sidewalk and subjected to racist and derogatory comments by four male students wearing engineering jackets. Upon learning of this situation and after consultation with the victim, a statement from the administration deploring this incident was placed immediately on the Queen’s website, and a letter was sent by the leadership of the Faculty of Applied Science to all engineering students requesting their help in the ongoing investigation of the incident.

While the actions of four individuals should not be generalized to all Queen’s students, it is the University’s obligation to ensure that as a community it does all it can to promote a welcoming, prejudice-free environment at Queen’s. As the Principal and Vice-Principals’ statement says, the Queen’s community is “…committed to the ideal of an inclusive campus where all members of our community are…able…to pursue their academic goals in an environment not merely tolerant, but respectful and supportive as well.” Progress toward that goal “…is urgent and imperative.”

No member of the Queen’s community – indeed, no one, anywhere – should be exposed to racist abuse and physical intimidation. While such behaviour, unfortunately, exists in communities everywhere, it will not be tolerated at Queen’s.

As a community dedicated to learning and personal growth, Queen’s will continue to provide opportunities to confront and, through education and increased understanding, attempt to eliminate, prejudice and discrimination in all its forms. However, being a member of the Queen’s community is a privilege, not a right, and such membership carries with it the responsibility to act in keeping with Queen’s values. Hence, whatever action is required to ensure an environment free of prejudice and discrimination will be taken.

The Principal announced her intention to provide opportunities for the entire community to engage in discussion and propose actions regarding the culture of inclusiveness and mutual respect which must continue to characterize Queen’s University.

**Final Report on Admissions and Enrolment**

Enrolment targets established by the Senate for 2007/2008 year have been achieved in almost all of our programs. Total enrolment increased slightly over 2006 to 20,518. Of particular note is the increase in both out-of-province and international students in keeping with our Strategic Plan. The full Report on 2007 Enrolment is included in the Board Agenda.

**Review of Athletics and Recreation**

The Principal reported that she had received literally hundreds of responses – written and verbal – regarding the recommendations of the Review of Athletics and Recreation prepared by Robert Crawford and Janice Deakin. Responses came from Queens’ faculty, staff and students, alumni, retirees, Trustees, parents of Queen’s student athletes, Kingston residents, high school coaches and teams and coaches and teams from sister institutions in Canada. Given the tremendous level of interest in this Review, in addition to the call for written submissions, the Principal put the topic on the Senate agenda and convened a Town Hall meeting in order to maximize the opportunities for input.
The feedback received on the Review focused on a number of major themes.

There was a concern that programs of fitness and health lifestyles for the entire Queen’s community should be maintained and indeed enhanced in addition to varsity sports programs.

There was also much discussion, pro and con, regarding the recommendation to consider an increase in the student Athletic fee to enhance the financial base for athletics and recreation programs, as well as relatively positive responses to increasing team sponsorships and the support from alumni for specific teams.

Recommendations regarding flexibility in timing of acceptance to Queen’s, course scheduling and preference in course selection for varsity student athletes received mixed reviews. Some were passionately against, and others saw this as essential if Queen’s is to be competitive in recruitment of student athletes.

By far the most controversial recommendation is the proposed reduction in the number of varsity teams in order to focus resources – human and financial – toward the goal of being more competitive. In addition to scores of letters in support of retaining particular varsity teams, there is a tremendous amount of input – pro and con – regarding the philosophy of focus versus breadth in varsity programs. The responses on both sides of the issue were passionate and thoughtful; and, all reflected a keen interest in developing a recreation and athletics model which meets the needs of all students and is in keeping with Queen’s values. The Principal said that she totally concurred with that view, and it will be her prime consideration as she develops her response to the recommendations of the Review.

**Relationship with City of Kingston (beyond Aberdeen)**

Homecoming 2007 was a tremendous success, with some 7,000 alumni returning to Queen’s for a weekend of celebration and reunion. The Golden Gaels football team beat the Windsor Warriors handily! From class dinners, concerts, a Great Debate on the Kyoto Accord, and the Queen’s Bands to a new AMS-sponsored night festival cum fireworks, the Queen’s campus was alive with activities for all alumni – young and not so young.

The Principal thanked the Alumni Association and Vice-Principal (Advancement) David Mitchell and his entire team for all their efforts to ensure a memorable Homecoming for all.

The Principal gave a special thank you as well to Trustee Dan Rees for all his efforts as President of the Queen’s University Alumni Association to expand the activities and enhance the vibrancy of the QUAA. Many more alumni have become engaged in the activities of the QUAA and changes have transformed the organization.

The Principal welcomed Sarah Renaud, the new President of the QUAA, who as former President of the Toronto branch, brings a wealth of experience to her new role.

The Principal invited Trustees to join her in thanking our student leaders, alumni and community “blue hat” volunteers, faculty, staff, students and Vice-Principal Deane and his leadership team for all they did to help ensure a safe gathering on Aberdeen Street during the Homecoming weekend. Working in partnership with the City, the Police, emergency services and the citizens of Kingston, the event was contained and without major incident.

While the overall numbers were down, an estimated six thousand people congregated on Aberdeen, the majority of whom were not from Queen’s and included high school, college and university students and others from across Ontario and from as far as New Brunswick and B.C. It is clear that Queen’s alone cannot control such a heterogeneous gathering.
The Principal reported that the City Council passed a motion inviting Queen’s University to join with the City to find solutions to a number of shared problems, including, but not limited to the Aberdeen street event.

A working group of senior city staff and University representatives will be constituted which will examine areas of mutual concern, including adequate housing standards, an issue of great importance to Queen’s students which the university has frequently highlighted to city officials.

Other steps are being taken as well. On Tuesday, November 27, Vinny Rebelo, a community leader and Queen’s alumnus, hosted a Symposium to discuss the Aberdeen phenomenon and how to approach it from a community-wide perspective. Queen’s student leaders, university officials, police, city officials and citizens all came together to increase mutual understanding and propose solutions.

About a year ago, in this same spirit of partnership, we suggested the formation of a cross-sector Roundtable to address the future of Kingston. The Roundtable is co-chaired by the Principal and Walter Fenlon, one of the region’s business leaders. Representatives of the private, public and not-for-profit sectors have come together to identify and implement initiatives directed at enhancing the city’s economy and quality of life - from creating a wireless community, to enhanced transportation and tourism, to business attraction and retention.

The Roundtable has opened up many new opportunities for a healthy and productive relationship with the city, and already has reaped benefits for Queen’s in terms of city and business support for a number of initiatives, including the proposed Technology Park and the acquisition of available institutional land.

**Provincial and Federal Relations**

At the provincial level, Queen’s welcomed the announcement of the new Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Mr. John Milloy, MPP from Kitchener. Mr. Milloy has extensive federal and provincial experience. He is sensitive to the needs of the sector and is quite open regarding approaches to meet the needs of institutions. It is clear that he will be a champion for postsecondary education in the province.

The various issues which comprised Queen’s advocacy plans in the run up to the Ontario provincial election remain the same and are driven by the need for increased levels of graduate education, increased faculty, and the expansion and enhancement of physical facilities.

While it is too soon to predict the details of the 2008/2009 budget, Queen’s has started its planning process which was described in the Financial Update distributed to the community in November and sent to Trustees for information. This document summarizes Queen’s budget position, analyzes the issues facing the University and related planning assumptions for the next fiscal year. It addresses enquiries received regarding the funding of current capital projects in relationship to the operating budget. A Town Hall meeting next week will allow all interested members of the Queen’s community the opportunity to provide input and seek further clarification regarding the budget planning process.

The Principal drew attention to the 2007-08 Report on the Annual Budget included with the Agenda. This Report details the current budget in the context of the specific goals of the Strategic Plan.

The planning process described in the Financial Update document reflects the fact that as an institution we need to be prepared if 2008/2009 allocations from the provincial government are again insufficient to cover inflationary costs and negotiated compensation increases. Clearly, revenue enhancement is the top priority – be it through successful advocacy at both the provincial and federal levels, enhanced philanthropy or new programs. Of special importance in our advocacy is ensuring that the federal transfer made for postsecondary education for the 2008/2009 budget year
will, indeed, reflect a net increase in allocations from the provincial government. These federal transfer funds, coupled with an increase in quality improvement funds from the province, would enable Queen’s to continue the faculty recruitment initiatives to enhance educational and research programs.

**National/International Profile: Rankings**

With respect to rankings, Queen’s tied for second place in *Maclean’s* – although the University did not participate in this survey. Queen’s received more A+s than any other university in the country in the *Globe and Mail University Report Card*, and ranked seventh in research intensity by *Research Infosource*. Finally, Queen’s moved into the top 100 universities in the world as ranked by the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, one of only six Canadian universities to rank in the top 100, up from last year’s ranking of 176.

While the shortcomings of many of these rankings are well known, rankings are part of our reality and they do reflect and impact upon Queen’s national and international profile. Given that one of our strategic objectives is to increase our profile as a world-class research-intensive university, these results are, indeed, good news. The Principal congratulated the faculty and staff who made them possible and who work tirelessly to provide an excellent education for the students, even as they carry out path-breaking research and scholarship. These rankings reflect the success of their efforts, even in the face of financial pressures and ongoing space constraints.

The question now is how to continue to enhance programs of teaching and research in the face of tremendous competition for both high quality students and new faculty. It has recently been reported that by 2016, Canadian universities will need 21,000 new faculty members to replace retirees, and from 3,600 to 13,600 new faculty to address a range of projected increases in student enrolment. Clearly, Queen’s needs to position itself now to be successful in attracting the high quality faculty it will require to be successful in attracting talented students, long a hallmark of Queen’s. To be competitive in attracting such students, Queen’s must also ensure the quality of the out-of-class experience – the broader learning environment – so much a part of the Queen’s experience.

**Capital Projects in the context of Institutional Strategic Goals**

Queen’s has devoted much energy over the last several years to assessing capital needs in the context of goals, identifying and obtaining new resources to help address these needs, and analyzing institutional capacity to support the kinds of capital projects that will be essential to retain a competitive position in the Ontario and Canadian postsecondary education systems.

Clearly, one of the major considerations in undertaking new capital projects is to fit with the mission and strategic priorities of the institution.

For any project, the short and long-term opportunities gained by such institutional investment must be considered, as well as the opportunity costs if it does not go forward, all in the context of the ability of the institution to finance the initiative without unduly impacting other budget requirements.

The Queen’s Centre, some 6 years in planning, is the physical embodiment of the Strategic Goal to Enhance Queen’s Distinctive Learning Environment. The prioritization of this project by the campus followed many years of addressing such academic priorities as Stauffer Library, Chernoff Hall and the Biosciences Complex for the Faculty of Arts and Science, Beamish-Munro Hall for the Faculty of Applied Science and Goodes Hall for the School of Business. It reflects the commitment of Queen’s to the tremendous importance of the out-of-class “broader learning environment.” The campus has not addressed in a meaningful way such non-academic facilities since 1971 when Queen’s enrolment stood at 7,800. The doubling of space planned for the Queen’s Centre is totally consonant with the needs of a student body which now numbers some 20,000.

The Queen’s Centre will ensure that the athletics, recreation and fitness facilities, as well as the student life space at Queen’s will be second to none. Without such initiatives, the “D” grade received last year in the *Globe and Mail Report Card* for athletics and recreation space could affect
Queen’s ability to attract students who are looking not only at Queen’s, but other high quality universities in Canada and beyond.

It is important to point out that the Queen’s Centre also addresses critical academic needs on the campus. It responds directly to the Strategic Goal of Strengthening Research and Graduate Programs in Strategic Areas since it includes a major increase in the teaching and research space of the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies, a School which has a vibrant and growing graduate program.

The Queen’s Centre, once completed, will transform the campus and will be a symbol of commitment to the kind of student experience that has long defined Queen’s.

The Fields and Stadium Project, currently in the planning stage, will enhance even further the quality of students’ out-of-class experience at Queen’s, and will provide outdoor student athletes with the kinds of practice fields, stadium, team rooms and academic support services and facilities which will foster their athletic and academic growth. Current facilities on the West Campus, designed for some 7,000 students, are rapidly deteriorating, and this project will help ensure the opportunity for intramural and varsity athletes to excel, and allow Queen’s to compete successfully for the most talented student athletes. Like the Queen’s Centre, this project addresses an important component of the broader learning environment (Strategic Goal 3), and would give testimony to our commitment to being a student-centered university.

The balance of the Capital Projects currently in the planning stage address the urgent space needs of a number of the academic programs. It is important to note that the campus was designed for approximately 10,000 students. Now, with an enrolment of some 20,000, capital projects which expand current facilities, or represent new facilities which then free up space to decompress our current, overcrowded facilities are of major importance as we look to the future.

Institutional differentiation is the most likely way that Ontario – and Canada as a whole – will be able to meet both the growing need and demand for a postsecondary education, as well as the research and innovation requirements of a competitive economy.

Differential investment in research-intensive universities versus those institutions which focus particularly on undergraduate teaching has now been proposed in a number of provinces. Research-intensive universities which are committed to the highest quality undergraduate, graduate and professional education are, by their very nature, more resource intensive, and if Canadian universities are to compete on a world scale, a new paradigm for resource allocation may well be necessary.

Queen’s Strategic Planning resulted in a very clear message: while remaining absolutely committed to the highest quality undergraduate and professional educational programs, members of the Queen’s community are also committed to developing research excellence and the size and vibrancy of its programs of graduate education. Trent and Acadia are excellent, primarily undergraduate, institutions, but they are not our comparators – the University of Toronto, McGill, McMaster, Western and the University of Alberta are.

Having chosen to compete as a student-centered, research-intensive university, certain imperatives follow. First and foremost, Queen’s has to increase its faculty complement. Despite the excellent results in the recent ranking exercises, it is clear that a relatively high student-to-faculty ratio is having an impact on the kind of collaborative, highly interactive undergraduate education prioritized in the Strategic Plan and which will be necessary to continue attracting the best students from Ontario, Canada and across the world.

Last year saw the first improvement in the student-faculty ratio in five years. Given the overarching primacy of this goal, it is logical to ask why all available institutional resources are not devoted to such hiring requirements.
The answer is straight-forward. The institutions with which Queen’s wishes to be associated in terms of its mission are competing for the very same faculty, and they are doing it through developing the kinds of facilities and support services essential for teaching and advanced research and scholarship in the natural sciences, social sciences and the humanities.

There will be tremendous competition over the next decade for faculty; and Queen’s will need to be both creative and opportunistic if it is to compete successfully for the kind of faculty necessary to fulfill our vision, and to ensure that in a time of increasing institutional differentiation Queen’s can enhance – not lose – its identity as a research-intensive university committed to the highest quality educational programs.

Facilities will have to be expanded and competitive in terms of meeting the teaching, research and scholarship needs of the faculty we must attract and retain. All the salary money in the world will not be sufficient to meet this goal. Building expansions and entire new facilities, as well as renovations of current space are necessary to support teaching and sophisticated programs of research.

The Arts Campus, currently in the planning stage, addresses long-standing needs in the Performing and Visual Arts, directly addressing Queen’s Goals to Enhance the Undergraduate Experience, Strengthen Programs of Research and Enhance Relationships with External Constituencies. The planned construction of a new Performing Arts Centre would address the need for a suitable performance venue which has been a priority for Music Department for years in terms of both student and faculty recruitment, and it would also provide an opportunity to expand relationships with the Kingston community.

In addition, over the long-term, movement of the departments of Music, Drama, Film and Art to this new campus would free up close to 70,000 NASF on the main campus, providing a major opportunity for expansion of other departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science, departments which are overcrowded and currently unable to accommodate the new faculty who will be essential to meet their teaching requirements and research competitiveness.

Plans underway for an expansion of Goodes Hall flow directly from rapidly increasing student demand, and the resulting requirement for increased teaching and faculty research space. Such an expansion directly responds to the goal to Build on Undergraduate and Professional Program Strengths and to Strengthen Research and Graduate Programs in Strategic Areas. Such expansion will solidify the excellent standing of the Queen’s School of Business, and be responsive to the needs of Ontario and Canada for well-educated management professionals.

The planned Medical Education Expansion flows directly from these same goals to build on professional program strengths and to strengthen our research and graduate programs in strategic areas. Just as Chernoff Hall and the Biosciences Complex responded to the needs of Chemistry and Biology in the Faculty of Arts and Science, a new state-of-the-art teaching facility for the School of Medicine is now required to ensure the quality of the learning experience and, critically, to meet the mandates of external accreditation. This new facility would also help to relieve the space pressures in Botterell Hall and thereby provide an opportunity to recruit the faculty essential to ongoing programs of research and graduate education in the Health Sciences.

The final project, the Advanced Research and Innovation Technology Park, will be brought to the Board for approval later in this meeting. While it does not represent a typical capital project in terms of funding requirements, it does present the opportunity to alleviate space compression on the main campus. Movement of two campus-based programs to the Novelis space will free up some 12,000 square feet for reassignment, possibly to departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science. As the Technology Park matures, other space will also be available to a variety of Queen’s Research Centres under the guidelines developed for tenants of the Park.
This initiative will have a major positive impact on addressing our goals of strengthening research in strategic areas, enhancing our role as a provincial and national resource through its novel approach to innovation and commercialization, and strengthening our relationships with external constituencies as we partner with the private sector to enhance research facilities for our faculty and the economic development of our region.

Taken together, these approved and in planning, capital projects reflect campus goals and priorities, and will help ensure Queen’s position in Canada as a research-intensive university committed to the highest quality undergraduate and professional programs.

While this is an ambitious list, it accurately reflects the priority capital needs which must be addressed if Queen’s is to be competitive over the next decade for the highly talented faculty so essential to its mission. Clearly, however, Queen’s will need to phase these projects in keeping with our analysis of the financial commitments they represent and our overall capacity to meet them. Indeed, no project will be brought before the Board for its review until such an analysis is complete and a funding plan is established.

In contrast to many other institutions, Queen’s did not receive a land grant when it was founded. Over the years it has had to slowly acquire the land required to build the facilities necessary for our growing student body and academic and research programs. Queen’s is currently landlocked. Few building sites remain on the campus to address current or long-term capital expansion. However, given that a number of institutional and private sector land holdings are becoming available in Kingston, the Board has a rare opportunity and responsibility to consider the acquisition of properties which will be critical to the future of the University.

The recently completed purchase of the Tett Centre land and the planned acquisition of the adjacent Corrections Canada land will enable Queen’s to address, over time, the long-standing needs of faculty in the performing and visual arts.

Acquisition of the Prison for Women site will provide the flexibility for future teaching and research space. Although no specific plans have been developed for this land – apart from the possible move of our Archives to the administration building on the site – the landbanking of this well-situated property will serve Queen’s well as it looks to future capital needs. Likewise, the proposed acquisition of over 48 acres of land at the Novelis site will, as described, have a major impact on the research collaborations and facilities available to faculty.

12. **Question Period** – no questions were asked.

13. **Student Affairs**

   a) **Rector – Johsa Manzanilla** (Appendix L, page 102)

   The Rector reiterated the points covered in her written report concerning the Senate Review of the Student Code of Conduct, the Athletics Review, and Accessibility.

   The Rector went on to speak about additional items:

   - **Tuition** – Queen’s must continue its focus on student assistance to counter the significant financial challenges facing many students.
   - **Racial Inclusiveness** – the distressing incident on November 14 in which a female faculty member was the subject of racial slurs and forced from a campus sidewalk by a group of students, has caused great concern across campus. The announcement of the appointment of Dr. Barrington Walker as Diversity Advisor to the Vice-Principal (Academic) is a welcome step, but much more must be done.
• **Rector Resignation** – the Rector announced that she planned to finish her term effective April 30 and would notify the AMS so that elections for her replacement could proceed early in 2008.

b) **AMS – President, Kingsley Chak** (Appendix M, page 104)

The President drew attention to the following items in his written report:

- **Aberdeen Symposium, November 27** – This event, organized by Kingston businessman and Queen’s alumnus, Venicio Rebelo, was a well attended community-university event with a constructive focus on improvements for 2008.
- **AMS Non-Academic Discipline** – of 136 complaints, 72 have been processed and settled, 12 have been dropped and 52 are in process.
- **New Executive for 2008/2009** – the President said that he looked forward to introducing the next AMS executive to the Board at the March meeting.

c) **SGPS – President, Arash Farzam-Kia** (Appendix N, page 107)

Vice-President (Internal) Brendan Lanigan gave the report on behalf of the President and made the following additional remarks:

- The SGPS appreciated the quick and cooperative way the University administration facilitated the bursary solution to address financial difficulties caused by UHIP health insurance.
- The SGPS concerns about the negative impacts of the proposed tuition increases.
- The SGPS concerns about the lack of space, particularly office and laboratory space, dedicated to graduate student use.

Undergraduate Trustee, Michael Ceci, reported that six Trustees had accepted the invitation issued by students for lunch on the Friday of the Board meeting. He encouraged Trustees to take up the invitation for March if possible.

M. Ceci also offered Trustee jacket patches to those who own Queen’s jackets.

II MOTIONS FROM COMMITTEES

1. **Advancement Committee**

   a) **Amendment to Policy on Gifting of Securities** (Appendix O, page 108)

      Moved by T. O’Neill
      Seconded by R. Burge and agreed:

      That, on the recommendation of the Advancement Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the revisions to the Policy on Gifting of Securities as outlined in the summary on page 108 of the Agenda.

      Carried 07-44

   b) **Trustees Annual Giving Challenge**

      T. O’Neill reported that, following the discussion about Annual Giving at the September Board meeting, Trustee David Whiting had issued a challenge at the Advancement Committee.

      D. Whiting explained that he had been inspired by the Principal’s commitment to grow the endowment fund in a substantial way and the description by Trustee Daniel Bader of a matching gift program by the Board at his alma mater. D. Whiting and D. Bader each pledged $5,000 and challenged other Advancement Committee members to contribute. As a result, the
fund grew to $30,000. D. Whiting proposed that other Trustees join in and try to reach a total of $60,000.

The Trustees challenge fund will be used in the Annual Fund drive to encourage new donors by matching their gifts from the Trustees fund.

2. **Audit Committee**

   a) **Appointment of External Auditors for year-ended April 30, 2008**

   Moved by M. Daub
   Seconded by T. O’Neill and agreed

   That, on the recommendation of the Audit Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the appointment of KPMG as the External Auditor for Queen’s University for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2008.

   Carried 07-45

3. **Environmental Health & Safety**


   The Chair introduced the two policy statements, noting that the Board is required to review and, if no revisions are required, reaffirm the statements annually. She reported that the Environmental Health and Safety committee had conducted the review on behalf of the Board and found that no revisions were required.

   a) **Policy Statement on Environmental Management** (Appendix P, page 115)

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

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

   Carried 07-46

    b) **Policy Statement on Health and Safety** (Appendix Q, page 116)

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

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

   Carried 07-47

4. **Finance Committee**

   The Chair of the Finance Committee, G. Anderson, reported on two items from the Committee’s meetings:

   1. The Committee held a special session on Thursday, November 29, on financial planning and capital budgets with input from consultant, Prager, Sealy & Co, LLC. The Committee discussed the importance of ongoing capital programs, noting that Queen’s debt profile is favourable relative to other universities. The Committee also concluded that the Queen’s Centre project occupies a central role within the broad strategic goals of the University.
2. The Committee received an update on Phase 1 of the Queen’s Centre. A revised budget is anticipated and consideration of locking in the price. Trustees will be notified of a teleconference on this topic in two weeks time.

a) **Tuition Fees 2008-09** (Appendix R, page 117)

Moved by G. Anderson  
Seconded by M. Daub and agreed  
Opposed: Rector J. Manzanilla and Undergraduate Trustee M. Ceci

That the Board of Trustees approve the Tuition Fees for 2008/2009 outlined in Table 1A for Medicine, Graduate and International (Domestic Students) and Table 1B for Medicine, Graduate and International (International Students)

| Table 1A  | Recommended Tuition Fee 2007-08 and 2008-09*  |
| Medicine, Graduate and International  | (Domestic Students)  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate and Professional Programs</th>
<th>Approved 2006-07</th>
<th>Approved 2007-08</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Proposed 2008-09</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 1 – 4</td>
<td>$7,030</td>
<td>$7,311</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$7,604</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Arts, Science, Physical and Health Education, Music, Fine Art, Computing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$4,382</td>
<td>$4,579</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>$4,785</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$4,361</td>
<td>$4,557</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$4,762</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$4,361</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$4,740</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$4,361</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$4,717</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$8,910</td>
<td>$9,623</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$10,393</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$10,350</td>
<td>$9,266</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$10,005</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$9,060</td>
<td>$9,785</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$8,759</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$8,154</td>
<td>$8,480</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$9,159</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td>$4,361</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$4,717</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent (education courses)</td>
<td>$4,361</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$4,717</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ Courses (per course)</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$865</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$9,678</td>
<td>$10,452</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$11,288</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$9,319</td>
<td>$10,065</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$10,870</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$9,319</td>
<td>$9,692</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$10,468</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$14,175</td>
<td>$14,884</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$15,628</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix A

**Table 1A – Continued**

**Recommended Tuition Fee 2007-08 and 2008-09*  
Medicine, Graduate and International  
(Domestic Students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Programs – Domestic Fees</th>
<th>Approved 2006-07</th>
<th>Approved 2007-08</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Proposed 2008-09</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5,572</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5,365</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5,572</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5,365</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5,365</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>$5,159</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5,365</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Management (fee per 1/2 credit )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehabilitation Therapy Professional Masters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc (OT) and MSc (PT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$7,452</td>
<td>$8,048</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$8,370</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$7,176</td>
<td>$7,750</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$8,370</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Policy Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Public Administration (MPA)</td>
<td>$7,107</td>
<td>$7,320</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$7,759</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time MPA (PMPA) per course</td>
<td>$1,065</td>
<td>$1,097</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$1,163</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Industrial Relations</td>
<td>$5,572</td>
<td>$6,018</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$6,499</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Urban and Regional Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$5,572</td>
<td>$6,018</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$6,499</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$5,365</td>
<td>$5,795</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$6,258</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tuition is approved at the program level, based on normal full-time course load, and assessed at the course level  
** Moving to a Masters program, OCGS approval pending, fees to be reported in May 2008  

NOTE: fees highlighted in gray are proposed for Board approval.
* Tuition is approved at the program level, based on normal full-time course load, and assessed at the course level

NOTE: fees highlighted in gray are proposed for Board approval

Table 1B
Recommended Tuition Fee 2007-08 and 2008-09*
Medicine, Graduate and International
(International Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate and Professional Programs</th>
<th>Approved 2006-07</th>
<th>Approved 2007-08</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Proposed 2008-09</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 – 4</td>
<td>$18,342</td>
<td>$18,709</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$19,457</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science (including Con-Ed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Arts, Science, Physical and Health Education, Music, Fine Art, Computing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,765</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$20,925</td>
<td>$21,344</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$23,051</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$20,925</td>
<td>$21,344</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$22,197</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$19,023</td>
<td>$19,403</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$20,177</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$17,121</td>
<td>$17,463</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$18,162</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent (education courses)</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$19,023</td>
<td>$19,403</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$20,956</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$19,023</td>
<td>$19,403</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$20,180</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$19,023</td>
<td>$19,403</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$20,180</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$21,420</td>
<td>$21,848</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$22,941</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$21,420</td>
<td>$21,848</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$22,722</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$21,420</td>
<td>$21,848</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$22,722</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$21,420</td>
<td>$21,848</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$22,722</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,765</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Practitioner**</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tuition is approved at the program level, based on normal full-time course load, and assessed at the course level

** Moving to a Masters program, OCGS approval pending, fees to be reported in May 2008

NOTE: fees highlighted in gray are proposed for Board approval
M. Ceci said that students had many concerns about the tuition proposal. He noted the discrepancy between government funding and what students pay. Fluctuating exchange rates make planning difficult. International students need predictability for the four years of their program. He recommended that the University issue a supplement on Tuition similar to the Financial Update produced by the Vice-Principal (Operations and Finance). He asked which International Students were consulted on the Tuition Proposal.

The Vice-Principal (Academic) described consultation with the SGPS, International Students and a special session at QUIC (Queen’s University International Centre). Students in need have access to financial aid once they arrive at Queen’s. Unfortunately, because provincial funding plans continue to be uncertain, the University has very little information in advance to provide a consistent and useful level of predictability for tuition fees. With respect to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated Programs - International Fees</th>
<th>Approved 2006-07</th>
<th>Approved 2007-08</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Proposed 2008-09</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,448</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,448</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Management (fee per 1/2 credit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehabilitation Therapy Professional Masters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc (OT) and MSc (PT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$14,790</td>
<td>$15,086</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$15,689</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Policy Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Public Administration (MPA)</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,236</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time MPA (PMPA) per course</td>
<td>$1,589</td>
<td>$1,589</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1,684</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Industrial Relations</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,448</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Urban and Regional Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,448</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tuition is approved at the program level, based on normal full-time course load, and assessed at the course level

NOTE: fees highlighted in gray are proposed for Board approval

Carried 07-48
international fees, Queen’s is conservative relative to other universities. Last year the increase was 2% and this year it is in line with domestic fee increases. Graduate fees have not been increased in ten years. Costs are far in excess of the these fee increases. He concluded by noting that the University takes tuition issues extremely seriously and strives to protect the quality of the education to which students have access.

The President of the AMS urged the University to enhance aid for international students and to undertake a study of the average income for these students.

The Vice-President of the SGPS noted that graduate students are Teaching Assistants and Research Assistants who provide valuable service to the University.

b) Update Signing Authorities (Appendix S, page 124)

Moved by G. Anderson
Seconded by M. Ceci and agreed

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustees approve amendments to the Signing Authorities to include the position of Controller, Financial Services.

Carried 07-49

c) Queen’s Centre Governance Model
G. Anderson reported that a document has been tabled with the Finance Committee that indicates good progress and he anticipated that the Board would deal with this item in May.

d) Goodes Hall Expansion Project – planning funds (Appendix T, page 134)

Moved by G. Anderson
Seconded by M. Daub and agreed

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee and the Campus Planning and Development Committee, the Board of Trustees approve an increase in planning funds from $300,000 to $600,000 for the Goodes Hall expansion project. The funds are to be provided by the Queen’s School of Business.

Carried 07-50

e) Arts Campus (Appendix U, page 135)

Moved by G. Anderson
Seconded by B. Palk and agreed

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee and the Campus Planning and Development Committee, the Board of Trustees approve an additional $350,000 in planning funds for the Arts Campus (J.K. Tett Centre) Project. The funds are provided by donations.

Carried 07-51

f) Medical Education Building – planning funds (Appendix V, page 136)

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 an allocation of $250,000 to undertake design work for the programming and schematic design development for the
new Faculty of Health Sciences Building. The funding is to be provided by the Faculty of Health Sciences.

Carried 07-52

The Dean of Health Sciences confirmed that new facilities were needed to accommodate the 40% percent enrolment expansion for the School of Medicine in the last seven years. New space was needed for labs, for small group active learning, for teaching positions and to comply with accreditation standards.

5. Committee Updates – Optional Oral Reports at Committee Chair’s Request

There were no additional updates.

III DISCUSSION SESSION no topic for November 30, 2007

During the Closed Session the Board approved the following appointments.

1. Nominating Committee Report

The Chair announced that Trustees Graham Davis and Toby Abramsky had agreed to serve on the Queen’s Centre Executive Committee.

Moved by K. Black
Seconded by J. Lougheed and agreed

That, on the recommendation of the Nominating Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the following committee appointments:

Motion 1:

The appointment of Anne Leahy as a member of the Environmental Health and Safety Committee, effective immediately.

Anne Leahy will move from the Advancement Committee to Environmental Health and Safety.

Carried 07-53

Motion 2:

The appointment of Jeff Chan as a member of the Advancement Committee, effective immediately.

Carried 07-54

Motion 3:

The appointment of Jerry Del Missier as a member of the Advancement Committee, effective immediately.

Carried 07-55

Motion 4:

The appointment of David Whiting as a member and as Vice-Chair of the Nominating Committee, effective immediately.

Carried 07-56
IV OTHER BUSINESS - none

The Board moved into Closed Session.

Theme Session – Saturday, December 1, 2007

The Board reconvened on Saturday morning for a theme session on “Creating an Impact: Enhancing Graduate Education at Queen’s” facilitated by the Vice-Principal (Academic) and the Associate Vice-Principal and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. In addition to an overview of Graduate Studies at Queen’s, presentations by graduate students and a panel discussion took place. Presentations are attached to these minutes.

Presentations by graduate students:
Jeremy Clarke, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Political Studies
Mary Caesar, MA candidate, Department of History
Stacey Smith, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering

Panel discussion:
Doug Munoz, Canada Research Chair in Neuroscience, Director, Centre for Neuroscience Studies
Arash Farzam-Kia, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Philosophy
Karen Dubinsky, professor in the Department of History
Eleanor Macdonald

VI ADJOURNMENT