Minutes
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Friday December 4, Saturday, December 5, 2009, Robert Sutherland Hall, Conference Room 202

Members Present: Principal and Vice-Chancellor, D. Woolf
The Chair, W. Young
The Rector, L. Jackson


I OPENING SESSION

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed the following to the December Board meeting:

- Vicky Bae – President of the Society of Graduate and Professional Students (SGPS)
- Heather Black – President of the Queen’s University Alumni Association (QUAA)
- Caroline Davis – VP (Finance and Administration) effective January 4, 2010
- The Chair congratulated VP (Academic) P. Deane on his appointment as President of McMaster University, effective July 1, 2010.

1. Adoption of Agenda

    Moved by D. Woolf
    Seconded by G. Lavery and agreed:

    That the Board adopt the Agenda as circulated with the provision that items 2-11 be approved, or received for information, by consent.

    09-49

Consent

2. Approval of the Minutes of October 2/3, 2009 and November 10, 2009 (confidential)
(Appendix A, page 1)

    09-50

3. Naming Dedications (Appendix B, page 27)

    Motion:
    That the Board of Trustees approves the following naming dedications in recognition of service or philanthropy, as indicated.

    09-49
I  In recognition of service:

The dedication of the Principal William Snodgrass Arboretum in recognition of the outstanding service of the sixth Principal of Queen’s College (1864-77)  

II  In recognition of philanthropy:

Queen’s Centre

The dedication of the Alumni Atrium on the ground level of the Queen’s Centre in recognition of the generous pledge from William and Amanda Young in support of Queen’s and the Queen’s Centre building project.  

The dedication of the Clubs Wing in the Queen’s Centre in recognition of the generous pledge from Bruce Mitchell in support of Queen’s, and the Queen’s Centre capital campaign.  

The dedication of a large Club Office in the Queen’s Centre in recognition of the generous pledge from Ted Fletcher in support of Queen’s, and the Queen’s Centre capital campaign.  

The dedication of the lab in the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies in recognition of the generous pledge from Great-West Life in support of Queen’s, and the Queen’s Centre capital campaign.  

The dedication of the main lobby in the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies in recognition of the generous pledge from Tom and Susan O’Neill in support of Queen’s, and the Queen’s Centre capital campaign.  

The dedication of a Faculty Office in the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies in recognition of the generous gift from Lorne Verabioff in support of Queen’s, and the Queen’s Centre capital campaign.  

Goodes Hall Expansion

The dedication of the Seating Area on the fourth floor in the new wing of Goodes Hall in recognition of the generous pledge from Chris Clark in support of Queen’s, and the Goodes Hall expansion capital campaign.  

The dedication of the main Atrium in Goodes Hall in recognition of the generous pledge from the BMO Financial Group in support of Queen’s, and the Goodes Hall Expansion fund.  

5. Advancement Quarterly Report (Appendix D, page 34)

For information of the Board of Trustees:

Renewal of the Human Mobility Research Centre for an additional five years until October 22, 2014, and proposed amendments to the Centre’s constitution.

Name change of the Department of Women’s Studies to the Department of Gender Studies

7. **Environmental Health and Safety Annual Report** (Appendix F, page 41)

8. **Financial update** (Appendix G, page 71)

9. **DBRS Credit Rating Report** (Appendix H, page 80)

10. **Promotion to Professor** (Appendix I, page 90)

11. **Committee Reports:**
   - Audit Report (Appendix J, page 98)
   - Pension Quarterly Report (Appendix K, page 100)

12. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

13. **Chair’s Report**

   **Statement from QBACC**
   The Chair explained that he had received a formal request for speaking privileges from Queen’s Backing Action on Climate Change (QBACC), in accordance with Regulation 6, Additional Operating Procedures of the Queen’s University Board of Trustees, http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/trustees/procedure/index.html. Jena Hall read a statement on behalf of QBACC (attached).

   **2009 Vanier Cup win by Queen’s Gaels**
   D. Bayne spoke eloquently about the “magical experience” of being present at the Vanier Cup game in Quebec City Vanier Cup on November 28, 2009, when the Gaels, came from behind in the second half to defeat the favourites, the Calgary Dinos, 33-31, to win the championship. The weekend before, the Gaels surprised everyone by winning against Laval’s Rouge et Or – Canada’s ninth CFL team – in Mitchell Bowl played at Richardson Stadium. The Gael’s win in the previous round over the Western Mustangs, also played at Richardson Stadium, brought the Yates Cup back to Queen’s after XX years. D. Bayne spoke of the enormous pride that he felt personally as the Gael’s 1968 Quarterback, and that he shared with faculty, students, staff, alumni and the University as a whole, as a result of the tremendous achievements of the “greatest ever team” in Queen’s football history.

   He went on to make an impassioned appeal that support be directed to the Fields and Stadium campaign. The Gaels had raised the national profile of Queen’s in an extraordinary way but had also drawn media comments about the sorry state of Queen’s football facilities. The contrast between Richardson Stadium and Laval’s brand new 18,500 seat stadium, that generates $200,000 in revenue per game, was hard to ignore.
Chancellor A.C. Baillie Award
The Chair congratulated D. Whiting on his success in raising additional funds from trustees so that the endowment will exceed the $50,000 required so that the first award to a student can be provided in the Fall of 2010.

Grant Hall Society Dinner, October 2, 2009
The dinner and the tribute to Principal Emeritus T. Williams was a wonderful Queen’s event. The Chair thanked Trustee K. Macmillan for her outstanding leadership as Chair of the Grant Hall Society.

John Orr Dinner, November 14, 2009
Another outstanding event was held by the Toronto Alumni and the John Orr Award was presented to former Trustee and benefactor T. O’Neill.

Agnes Benidickson Award, November 20
The Ottawa Alumni honoured Chancellor D. Dodge with the Benidickson award at a wonderful dinner.

Installation of Principal D. Woolf, October 26, 2009
The Chair said he was honoured to participate in the Principal’s installation on behalf of the Board of Trustees. The ceremony and dinner were a warm reflection of Queen’s collegial spirit at which the new Principal was surrounded by family, friends, faculty, staff, students and alumni.

a) Annual Board Effectiveness Survey (Appendix L, page 104)

The Chair spoke to the results of the third Annual Survey of Board Effectiveness completed by Trustees during October. Three years of results now form a valuable resource. Results are trending in the right direction reflecting improved effectiveness, although some improvement is indicated for committees.

Board effectiveness in financial oversight is a concern. More focus is needed on actual expenses versus budget and Trustees need to receive the appropriate information in a timely fashion in order to exercise effective oversight. New procedures for capital project approvals are expected to approve the rigour of Board scrutiny.

Board membership diversity was raised as a concern. The Nominating Committee discussed this at its meeting today and will report at the end of the meeting on the approach it has developed.

While Trustees report general satisfaction with the consent agenda format, there is a sense that care must be taken not to weaken the links between the Board and its committees. The Chair said he plans to consult with committee chairs about this.

The large size of the Board remains a concern; however, the current consensus is that, notwithstanding the size challenge, it is working well.

The 2009 survey included two new questions about the effectiveness of the board chair and committee chairs. The Chair apologized for a miscommunication with the Secretary about publishing these results. On reflection, and in keeping with the volunteer nature of the Queen’s Board, he believed that they should not be included in the published report. In future years, the committee chair results will be reported to the individual committee chairs, the Board Chair and the Nominating committee. The results for the Board Chair will be reported to the Chancellor and the Chair of the Nominating Committee.

Canadian University Governance, Research Project, McMaster University, DeGroote School of Business

The Secretary referred to the survey forms distributed to trustees for voluntary completion.
Governance

University Council – A task force has been initiated to look at a variety of issues, including the possible roles of the Council beyond its current mandate, and questions of interaction between the Council, the Board, the Senate and the alumni.

University Planning Committee (UPC) – The Principal will introduce a proposal at the Saturday session. The Senate began discussions in the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC) and at the November 26 Senate.

Provost – The Principal has placed a motion on the Board agenda for consideration on Saturday that Queen’s adopt the Provost model with effect May 1, 2010.

Board of Trustees – the Chair reported that, following consultation with the Principal and the Chancellor, he was in the process of pulling together a group of trustees, chaired by Katie Macmillan, with the purpose of reviewing a number of issues that have come to prominence over the last few years about board size, best practices, how trustees are appointed, representation and diversity issues. The group will consider how change could be implemented and over what time period and what might be the impact on the committee structure of the Board. He anticipated a read out at the March meeting with a report in May. He acknowledged that board reform is a sensitive topic and expressed confidence that this important review would be conducted in a collegial and inclusive way.

14. Principal’s Report

Principal Woolf began his report by congratulating the Gaels players, coaches, staff and supporters on their Vanier Cup victory. Queen’s athletic teams had accomplished a stellar season. For three weeks, seven Queen’s teams were in the national top ten.

Principal Woolf spoke about the following events:

- Installation of the Principal on October 26, 2009, followed by fall convocation on October 29 and 30.
- Student enrolment at Queen’s is now more than 22,000, on target and slightly increased from last year. (Final Report on Enrolment Appendix M, page 111).
- Focus on prevention of the spread of H1N1 on campus through vaccination clinics and monitoring flu-like symptoms.
- Principal’s participation in teaching History 121 and research assisted by a Research Associate and two PhD students.
- Alumni listening tour in October and November – seven Canadian cities, London (UK) and New York.
- Principal’s Alumni Review column encouraging philanthropic support for Queen’s.
- Celebration of Robert Buchan’s historic $10M gift to the Mining Department.
- Government relations activities including the October meeting of the Association of University and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), joining AUCC’s Standing Committee on International Relations; November Ontario Economic Summit in Niagara-on-the-Lake, co-chaired by Chancellor Dodge; Council of Ontario Universities (COU) president’s discussions of “Reaching Higher 2”; COU sustainability initiatives, such as the Climate Change Commitment.

Vice-Principal Deane reported as follows: On November 26 during University Day at Queen’s Park, the Minister of Training, Colleges, and Universities, along with the Minister of Environment, were presented with a pledge, signed by all Ontario University Executive Heads, titled Ontario Universities: Committed to a Greener World. The pledge acknowledges that universities have a responsibility to “assist in finding solutions to the challenges of environmental sustainability; to share knowledge about sustainability and climate change; and to incorporate,
Appendix A
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wherever possible, principles of sustainability into our own operations.” The full pledge can be viewed via a link on the COU website.

The pledge is one acknowledgment of the responsibility universities have in supporting sustainable practices and culture, but the Principal and the VP (Academic) believe strongly that Queen’s can provide an even more progressive example on the type of action required to tackle this serious and complex set of issues.

Along with Acting VP (Operations and Finance) Bryck, VP Deane explained that he had been co-chairing an advisory committee of some of top academic staff who work in environmental and sustainability research. The advisory panel is working with the Queen’s Sustainability Office to develop an aggressive Queen’s position to advance sustainability measures. A draft Queen’s Sustainability Framework will soon be released to the community for comment. This will establish core values in this area and outline how we can all be participants in reducing our impact on the environment. Over the coming weeks and months more will be said about this important priority all will be invited become part of the dialogue.

Principal Woolf added the he intends to sign the University and College Presidents’ Climate Change Statement of Action for Canada.

- Principal Woolf referred to research accomplishments that are detailed in the Research Report.
- School of Medicine – construction is underway at the corner of Stuart and Arch streets.
- QUASR – the finance system was implemented on November 30, 2009, and congratulations go to CIO S. Reynolds the team.
- Principal Woolf welcomed incoming VP(Finance and Administration) Caroline Davis. An adjunct professor in the School of Policy Studies, she is currently Assistant Deputy Minister, Resolution and Individual Affairs at Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and is a Chartered Accountant who has been a member of the federal civil service for more than 30 years.

Principal Woolf thanked outgoing Acting VP(Operations and Finance), Bill Bryck who returned to his alma mater in November 2008 to lead the portfolio with great enthusiasm and effectiveness.

- VP(Advancement) search process is in its final stages and the search for a VP(Research) is underway.
- Principal Woolf expressed pleasure that former Dean of Arts and Science, Bob Silverman will serve as interim VP(Academic) from May 2010 until June 2011.
- Principal Woolf thanked outgoing Dean of Education, Rosa Bruno-Jofré, who is completing her second five-year term at the end of December and welcomed Stephen Elliott whose term starts January 2010.
- Principal Woolf reported on his meetings with faculty boards across the University, including discussions about the financial situation.
- He went on to speak about the increasing compensation budget, the effect of the market meltdown on unfunded pension liabilities and endowments, as well as capital debt, that are among the components leading to the current deficit position.

Principal Woolf stated that the administration continues to work toward a balanced budget which Trustees mandated last May.

He explained that with regard to compensation costs, the 1-year 3% agreement with QUSA, and salary freezes taken by Vice- Principals, Deans and senior staff, are making a $2 million-dollar-a-year difference.

Local CUPE leaders are concerned about the university's financial situation, and Principal Woolf anticipated exploring possible solutions with them.
The University agreement with QUFA ends April 30, 2011. Principal Woolf met with the QUFA executive to present two proposals: first – it was agreed to reopen early retirement plan discussions, and to restart talks about anomalies funds and salary structure; second, Principal Woolf asked that the Executive consider proposing to its members a 2% reduction in the negotiated salary increase for 2010-11, with 1% being reallocated to each faculty member’s academic department, and the other 1% going to reduce the University’s deficit. Unfortunately, the QUFA executive declined the proposal. The University will continue to explore all options, including reviewing its real estate holdings to see what properties could be sold.

- Principal Woolf looked ahead to the academic planning process that will help to define priorities and ensure that activities, including capital planning, budgets and HR decisions, are driven by academic values and priorities.
- The Principal’s Innovation fund continues to support projects aimed at reducing costs and/or finding new sources of revenue. Various cost saving initiatives that have come forward from individual Faculties, Schools and Departments. However, it is quite evident that there must also be a focus on larger University-wide cost savings measures that will benefit all.
- Principal Woolf announced that he would introduce a million-dollar transition fund to help academic units, who need to transform, start doing so in the short term. This money will be borrowed from within and will be have to be paid back.
- Multiple solutions that include a combination of academic and operational innovation paired with some salary restraint, will move Queen’s on to a positive financial path, taking care to avoid irreparable damage to educational offerings.
- Diversity – Principal Woolf called on VP Deane to report.

At the conclusion of term of the first Diversity Advisor to the Vice-Principal (Academic), held by Dr. Barrington Walker, VP Deane felt it was important to pause and reflect on the needs of the institution in this area, and to reconsider the part which must be played by central administration in fostering an even more inclusive climate at Queen’s. It is obvious that while the administration must show bold leadership in this regard, all members of the university ultimately share in responsibility for the inclusiveness of our community; for that reason it has at times been unclear whether to appoint another Diversity Advisor to the Vice-Principal (Academic) remains the best way to invest limited resources.

In preparing to report on the progress made to date on recommendations made by the Principal’s Advisory Committee on Race Relations (1991) and the Henry report (2004), the VP(Academic) concluded that a comprehensive, university-wide accounting of initiatives in this area is both more urgently needed and more difficult to accomplish than has hitherto appeared to be the case. For that reason, and after discussions with Principal Woolf, the VP (Academic) decided that the Diversity Advisor position will remain unfilled for now, allowing the devotion of available resources to a full assessment of progress so far, and also to cement advancement towards a number of clearly defined objectives.

Dr. Adnan Husain, Associate Professor in the Department of History and Chair of the Senate Educational Equity Committee, has been invited to take on a role in the Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic) that will oversee the establishment of clear goals for the university to fulfill within set benchmarks and timelines. Vice-Principal Deane was very pleased to report that Dr. Husain has agreed to do this and will serve as Director of Educational Equity and Diversity Projects. In this capacity, Dr. Husain will not be responsible for responding to the day-to-day needs of the community, but will rather embark upon a complete assessment of the various diversity reports that have been tabled at Queen’s in the last two decades, and of the present status of recommendations made in those reports. In that context he will identify priorities for action and recommend timelines according to which they should be addressed. Dr. Husain is not being asked to produce yet another report or series of recommendations, but is tasked with coming to the Queen’s community with a plan of action and mechanisms for achieving our priorities. Dr.
Husain’s work will include a high level of transparency and communication that will be of benefit to the Board of Trustees in the coming months.

- Principal Woolf concluded his remarks by looking forward to his departure on Saturday for India as part of the Premier’s “Clean Tech” Mission to India.

15. **Question Period**

Trustees congratulated the Principal and the administration on the quality of the information provided in the quarterly Financial Update included in the agenda, and on the successful opening of the Queen’s Centre facilities at the beginning of December, including a big thank you to Trustee Andrew Pipe, one of the inspirational forces behind the Queen’s Centre and chair of the Queen’s Centre Executive Committee, for his dedication to the concept, development of the program and the completion of Athletics and Recreation Centre (ARC) and the School of Kinesiology.

16. **Student Affairs** (Appendix N)

a) **Rector** – (page 126)

The Rector spoke to her written report and highlighted current efforts to restore and promote the use of water fountains on campus as part of the Water Access Group’s campaign to increase access to municipal tap water. The Queen’s Centre is a good example of excellent installations in a new facility.

The Rector spoke about challenges facing some academic programs, such as Environmental Studies, where the reduction of lab courses undermines the viability of the program. Students are extremely concerned about these issues.

The Rector concluded her comments by observing that the academic plan will be difficult to develop and very important for the future of Queen’s.

b) **AMS President** (page 128)

The AMS President echoed the Rector’s comments of concern about budget constraints. He spoke about the newly opened facilities in the Queen’s Centre and the ongoing discussions about a management framework for student life.

In response to questions, M. Ceci confirmed that the Education Student Society Queen’s Centre fee is still under discussion and while there are a wide variety of opinions about the look of the Queen’s Centre, generally students are flocking to use the services now housed in the Athletics and Recreation Centre (ARC).

c) **SGPS President**

The President will report at the next meeting.
II COMMITTEE MOTIONS AND UPDATES

1. Audit Committee
   a) Audited Financial Statements ending April 30, 2009 (Appendix O, page 130)
      Moved by K. Brooks
      Seconded by G. Anderson and agreed:
      That, on the recommendation of the Audit Committee, the Board of Trustees approves the Audited Financial Statements of Queen’s University for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2009.
      09-60

   b) Appointment of external auditors for year ending April 30, 2010
      Moved by K. Brooks
      Seconded by M. Daub and agreed:
      That, on the recommendation of the Audit Committee, the Board of Trustees, appoints KPMG as the external auditors for Queen’s University for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2010.
      09-61

2. Environmental Health and Safety
   Moved by J. Nesbitt
   Seconded by G. Lavery and agreed:
   That, on the recommendation of the Environmental Health and Safety Committee, the Board of Trustees approve:
   a) Policy Statement on Environmental Management (Appendix P, page 160)
      09-62
   b) Policy Statement on Health and Safety (Appendix Q, page 161)
      09-63

3. Finance Committee
   a) International Student Fees (Appendix R, page 162)
      Moved by G. Anderson
      Seconded by B. Mitchell and agreed:
      That on the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustees approved the international tuition fees set out in Table 1 below:
## Table 1
### Recommended Tuition Fees 2010-11
(Students from other countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate and Professional Programs</th>
<th>Actual 2009-10</th>
<th>Proposed 2010-11</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$21,014</td>
<td>$23,115</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$20,235</td>
<td>$22,064</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$20,235</td>
<td>$21,247</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$20,235</td>
<td>$21,247</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Science (including Con-Ed)</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$17,026</td>
<td>$18,728</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$16,395</td>
<td>$17,877</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$16,317</td>
<td>$17,215</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$16,317</td>
<td>$17,133</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: % change for year over year fee increase per course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 - 5.5 courses</td>
<td>$24,093</td>
<td>$26,503</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 - 5.5 courses</td>
<td>$23,978</td>
<td>$25,298</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 - 5.0 courses</td>
<td>$20,987</td>
<td>$22,888</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 - 4.5 courses</td>
<td>$18,888</td>
<td>$19,832</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td>$16,944</td>
<td>$18,639</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent (education courses)</td>
<td>$16,317</td>
<td>$17,792</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$22,632</td>
<td>$24,895</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$21,794</td>
<td>$23,764</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$20,987</td>
<td>$22,884</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$17,026</td>
<td>$18,728</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$16,395</td>
<td>$17,877</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$16,317</td>
<td>$17,215</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 (Includes Advanced Standing Track)</td>
<td>$16,317</td>
<td>$17,133</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Actual tuition fees assessed may vary slightly from approved fees due to rounding.

**NOTE:** fees highlighted in gray are proposed for Board approval.
Table 1 – Continued
Recommended Tuition Fees 2010-11*
(International Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate and Professional Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Actual 2009-10</th>
<th>Proposed 2010-11</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$12,364</td>
<td>$12,364</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$11,906</td>
<td>$12,364</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$12,364</td>
<td>$12,364</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$11,906</td>
<td>$12,364</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$11,465</td>
<td>$11,906</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$11,465</td>
<td>$11,906</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Policy Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Public Administration (MPA)</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$17,280</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time MPA (PMPA) per course</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$2,430</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Industrial Relations</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$17,280</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$12,364</td>
<td>$13,353</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$11,906</td>
<td>$12,858</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated MBA</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Executive MBA (to a maximum of)</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell-Queen's MBA (to a maximum of)</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Management (fee per 1/2 credit)</td>
<td>$3,135</td>
<td>$3,276</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Rehabilitation Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc (OT) and MSc (PT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$16,944</td>
<td>$18,300</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$16,317</td>
<td>$17,622</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. Actual tuition fees assessed may vary slightly from approved fees due to rounding.

NOTE: fees highlighted in gray are the ones for which Board approval is being sought.

In response to a question from the SGPS President, VP(Academic) Deane noted that, because international tuition is deregulated, Queen’s can approve fees at any time. Last year students wanted to receive information early to plan ahead and were told to expect a maximum 5% increase. The provincial government does not provide funding grants for international students and so the University must seek to recover something close to full cost, but also tries to keep...
increases relatively modest. While faculty deans normally consult directly with their students, because international student fees are more centrally determined, the VP(Academic) holds annual sessions so that international students can voice their concerns. No meeting was held this year since the 5% increase had been forecast last year. In 2011 fees for new international undergraduate students will rise by 10%.

The Rector observed that there will be no increase for students at the masters and doctoral levels, and that increases to fees in professional programs were well within range of other schools.

The VP(Academic) said that the provincial government had indicated that guidelines on domestic fees for 2011 will be announced in the spring.

b) **Debt Strategies** (Appendix S, page 167)

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

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the conversion of Ontario Infrastructure Projects Corporation (OIPC) short-term financing and the issuance of additional longer-term debt, post December 2008, not to exceed 180M in additional debt, as earlier authorized.

The Chair explained that the motion presented in the agenda was modified by the Finance Committee. He clarified that the debt will not exceed 180M. If the additional $180M approved in October 2008 (motion 08-40) is exercised, the total debt would rise 240M.

The Chair offered the following two further clarifications:

(1) OIPC has loaned Queen’s $90M on beneficial terms for the Queen’s Centre and Tindall Field projects. On completion of the projects the advances must be converted to long term debt financing which will be done early 2010.

(2) The Finance Committee discussed to what extent the University needs additional debt to cover cash requirements going forward. Noting that, in addition to borrowing, Queen’s would have the possibility of drawing down its $25M line of credit.

In conclusion, the Finance Committee endorsed the motion presented but had discussion about the whole issue of cash management. The University is making an effort to exercise discipline and achieve clarity about cash management so that it does not carry debt it does not need.

The administration is to report in March on use of this authority. The University may stage going to markets for further debt and may decide not to exercise the option.

Because interest costs are materially lower than original forecasts, it is now a good point in time to lock down long term debt.

G. Anderson commented that this level of debt falls within the two rations in the Liability Management policy approved by the Board.

D. Raymond asked what role the term has in the decision about managing the balance sheet.

G. Anderson responded that this was not part of the policy.
VP Bryck explained that prior to OIPC borrowing, Queen’s total debt was the $90M debenture to expire in 2032, plus a small amount with CMHC until 2016. An initial $30M of OIPC advances for the Tindall Field/Garage had to be converted to a longer term, before going forward with Queen’s Centre debt. It was converted to a $30M five-year amortized loan, at the rate of 3.61%. The OIPC Queen’s Centre portion is limited to $75M then must be termed out. $60M has been advanced to date. Queen’s plans to go to the market in the New Year likely for a bullet debenture. Discussion of an internal sinking fund will occur at that time. Long term rates are currently favourable.

G. Anderson clarified that there are two kinds of debt involved: some debt has associated revenue streams, eg. ancillaries such as residences. Other debt must be funded by the operating budget, eg. Queen’s Centre.

c) Signing Authority (Appendix T, page 170)

Moved by G. Anderson
Seconded by D. Raymond and agreed:

That, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustees approve signing authorities to update position titles as outlined in Appendix T, pp 171-178.

   i. Investment Related Transactions
   ii. Authority to Sign Cheques
   iii. Use of the University Seal
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D. Raymond asked whether these resolutions were intended to cover a single or a series of transactions. Acting VP(Operations and Finance) B. Bryck responded that these resolutions delegate signing authority for large contracts and streams of payment, and that the Contract Signing Policy, approved by the Board of Trustees on October 2, 2009, guides the full range of operational signing authority.

4. Investment Committee (Appendix U, page 179)

a) Spending Policy – Formula Amendment (page 180)

Investment Committee Chair, L. Cannon, reminded Trustees that the spending policy and the formula to determine the payout is designed not to stint funding but to ensure the endowment is sustainable in the long term.

In response to a question, she said that the implications for the operating budget were “pennies” in relative terms, noting that the Yale method is a smoothing formula.

Moved by L. Cannon
Seconded by B. Palk and agreed:

That, on the recommendation of the Investment Committee, the Board of Trustees approve that the spending policy for the Pooled Endowment Fund continue to be based on the Yale method, but that the formula be amended to reflect a reduction in the spending rate from 4.5% to 4%, and that this decision should be reviewed annually.

09-67
5. Committee Updates - Optional Oral Reports at Committee Chair’s Request

No requests.

Thank You to Bill Bryck

Before moving into Closed Session, the Board showed its appreciation to Acting VP(Operations and Finance). B. Bryck responded that he had been honoured by the opportunity to serve his alma mater and wanted to thank all those in Operations and Finance who had worked so well in challenging economic circumstances to respond to ongoing demands while successfully launching important new initiatives such as QUASR.
III CLOSED SESSION (for distribution to Trustees only)
IV SATURDAY, December 5, 2009

Motion in recognition of Laval University (Letter of transmittal attached)

Moved by M. Daub
Seconded by D. Woolf and agreed unanimously:

The Board of Trustees of Queen’s University at Kingston, on behalf of all those members of the Queen’s family, including players, their families, students, alumni and fans alike, would like to formally thank the organizing committee and the larger Laval and Quebec City community for the extraordinarily warm and generous hospitality extended to them on the recent Vanier cup weekend. This was especially appreciated in light of the fact that their beloved Rouge et Or were not playing in the Cup. Such hospitality made the experience all that more rewarding and will long be remembered by those from Queen’s who attended.
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1. Provost Model (Appendix V, page 187)

Moved by D. Woolf
Seconded by M. Balanchuk and agreed

That the Board of Trustees re-designate the VP AC as Provost and VPA AC effective May 1, 2010
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During presentation of the motion the Principal noted the following:

While the Provost is now a common position in Canadian universities, it will be a departure for Queen’s.

a) Integrated Planning

This initiative will help to address the current need for Queen’s to move from “siloed” decision-making to integrated planning.

Collaboration and coordination among the Vice-Principal’s is important for an effective management team. The Provost will take on a leadership role among the Vice- Principals, but each will continue to report to the Principal.

The Provost, who is also the Vice-Principal (Academic), will control the budget and will ensure that academic priorities drive financial operations.

The partnership between the Provost and the Vice-Principal (Finance and Administration) will be an important one to ensure tracking, compliance and administrative support.

b) External Relations and Internal Operations

One priority for the Principal is to set and lead the strategic direction for Queen’s.

A division of focus between external relations and the detailed internal operational leadership will ensure both aspects are addressed fully.
Queen’s Principal must establish more presence and visibility at the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, federal, provincial and municipal governments, and other external organizations, as well as visiting key donors and stakeholders.

However, the Principal must also be present on campus, participating in the academic enterprise and staying in touch with students, faculty and staff.

The following aspects were explored during discussion:

The Principal reported that he had conducted consultation within the university and received predominantly positive responses. Deans and academics support the focus of budget control within the Vice-Principal (Academic) portfolio.

It will be important that there is a clear division of activities and details of how the workload will be shared.

The interim period prior to the permanent appointment of the Provost in 2011, will provide an opportunity to refine the details.

The budget challenges and associated reductions will reveal significant aspects of the portfolio.

The risk of a bottle neck at the Provost’s office must be avoided. It is a very large portfolio and problems have arisen at other institutions when this risk is not fully appreciated and addressed by providing the necessary supports.

The Provost search process must include a deep respect and awareness of Queen’s present culture and the change that must be successfully accomplished.

The Provost position is now the “industry norm” so Queen’s ability to recruit from a good pool of candidates is high. Many of the successful provosts in Canada have been able to transfer from one institution, or province, to another without problems.

The Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic) currently appears overloaded. The “staffing up” required to support the new Provost model, while necessary, may be viewed as yet another increase in administrative expense at the cost of academic programs.

Queen’s spends substantially less on administration than its peers and there are current deficiencies in the offices of the Vice-Principal (Academic) and the Vice-Principal (Finance and Administration). The Principal has initiated a review team to study what is required during the interim period. The potential bottleneck will be carefully examined during this process.

The Vice-Principal (Academic) said frankly that the need for a Provost has been self evident at Queen’s for a long time. Integrated planning is essential so that the academic plan will drive fundamental decision making across the university, with the structure to support this process.

Compatible personal relations will always be key. More important than the relationship between the Principal and the Provost, will be positive collaboration between the Provost and the Vice-Principals. While a lot depends on goodwill rather than structure, the chance of success can be maximized by putting a clear and robust structure in place.

The current Office of the Vice-Principal (Academic) is splendid but it has grown relatively little in response to increasing responsibilities over the last five years.
Speaking for all the Deans, the Dean of Arts and Science said that they supported the proposal, particularly as a means to make decisions for the right reasons, expeditiously. Bottle necks are always a risk, but with the correct support, the model should bring improvements.

Queen’s must guard against losing the noticeable presence of the Principal on campus. Some provost models in the US have led to “phantom presidents.” This is mainly a function of the presidential style but care must be taken to avoid an inadvertent consequence. The appointment of a Deputy Provost could help to avoid bottlenecks.

The Principal’s external role is more valuable than ever before. The introduction of the Provost will not make the Principal disappear. The Principal will become more visible to government and external agencies. The margin of difference in quality is going to be found externally.

At the same time, the operations of the university must be shaped and guided.

The Principal will continue to be directly responsible to the Board of Trustees and the Vice-Principals will continue to report directly to the Principal. The Provost is the senior Vice-Principal.

The Provost would be in permanent attendance at the Finance Committee of the Board along with the Vice-Principal (Finance and Administration).

The President of the SGPS said that SGPS members favour the appointment as a way to bring Queen’s up to the level of its peers. She urged due diligence to ensure the structure can avoid bottle necks.

Need to engage provincially, nationally and internationally has steadily increased in the last 15 years. Governments are keen to engage the leadership. Premier McGuinty’s “Clean Tech” mission to India that the Principal will join in the coming week is a good example of this critical area in the mandate of the modern university CEO.

The Vice-Principal (Human Resources) pointed to “strategy, structure, source of people, and the systems that glue the parts together” as critical elements to successful organizational change. Often attention is focused on the strategy and structure and then the rest of model is filled out. The internal systems that glue the whole together must address the detailed practical issues that arise from strategy and structure.

The challenge for the Finance Committee is integrating the budget with the academic plan. The move to the Provost will not in itself solve this challenge. There will be a lot of work to do. The budget must address the academic plan in the context of long term conceptual and political challenges. With the right technical advice, the Committee must project where university funding is going and plan how to support academic and infrastructure needs.

The opportunity to search for a Provost makes this an ideal time to embrace organizational change.

The Provost model is a global term. It is not an iron model. It is adaptable to the cultural environment.

The Principal must be freed to occupy his place on campus, in the community, in the province the nation and international. The Principal must be able to fulfill the expectation of Queen’s role, as an academic, intellectual and thoughtful leader in this community and other spheres.
2. **University Planning Committee** (Appendix W, page 191)

The Principal introduced the University Planning Committee (UPC) proposal by referring to Principal Mackintosh’s analogy of the Principal as the “isthmus” between the Board and the Senate and by noting that the isthmus had become flooded. The bicameral separation of the financial and fiduciary responsibilities of the Board from the academic responsibilities of the Senate had been appropriate, particularly for a smaller university thirty or forty years ago. Queen’s had a more porous structure at that time and dialogue was more immediate.

Now Queen’s does not have adequate linkage between the academic mission and its financial resources. The model of the UPC has worked effectively at other institutions; however, cultural institutional differences mean that one cannot overlay a model without tinkering and careful thought.

The UPC would create an institutional bridge apart from Principal and help ensure that academic decisions taken by Senate are taken in full knowledge of the financial consequences. The inclusion of Trustee members will ensure that the Board receives more and regular information about the academic enterprise.

The goal is to build a structure to ensure integrated planning. The UPC will not displace current committees such as the Board of Trustees Campus Planning and Development Committee (CPDC). For the purposes of integrated planning, the Provost proposal is part A and the UPC proposal is part B.

The UPC proposal has been reviewed initially by the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC) which posed a number of questions that were discussed in an informal Senate session on November 26, 2009. (Appendix W, pp 191-197.) SORC will continue discussion in January and will receive a summary of today’s Board of Trustees’ discussion to inform its deliberations. SORC will report to the Senate (in January or February) with its recommendations. Senate’s decision will be transmitted to the Board of Trustees.

L. Jackson noted that the proposal was similar to a model in use at McMaster and asked the Principal to speak about his experiences with that model. Principal Woolf said that, while he was not a member of the UPC at McMaster, as a dean he was responsible for submitting a major initiative to the UPC for the Communication Studies program. The UPC met monthly and was relatively small in size. A key feature is that its members act on behalf of the best interests of the university as a whole, rather than as representatives of particular disciplines or units.

I. van Nostrand agreed with the concept of integrated planning; however, he expressed concerns about the proposed structure and membership. Structure: the Board of Trustees needs to exercise its oversight role more effectively and the proposal risks undermining the stringent reviews undertaken by Board Committees, such as Finance. The proposed UPC membership appeared to be dominated by administration. A twenty person committee is not a small committee but there are only three trustees. Members should be selected by the respective nominating committees rather than being ex officio. He called for more specificity around supporting lines and favoured the establishment of a subcommittee of the Finance Committee.

Principal Woolf responded that there was no intent in the proposal to undercut the committee structure of the Board of Trustees or of the Senate. The appropriate mechanisms to select membership would be part of the second step of the proposal. He described the role of the UPC as “a funnel” to ensure that proposals receive a rigorous and fair review before they reach the committee approvals stage. An example is enrolment planning that could be done in a more integrated way through the UPC.

G. Anderson pointed out that the UPC is a planning rather than operations committee. It will not be involved in the day-to-day.
D. Raymond asked about the UPC’s ability to constrain some decisions. This is implied in the description of the Budget Subcommittee, although it is somewhat weak. Clarity in the mandate will be important, particularly if differential allocation of resources is contemplated.

Principal Woolf said he was reluctant to use constraint language and wanted to strike a balance that would preserve the existing roles of the Board and of the Senate. The proposed Budget Subcommittee is advisory; it does not make the decisions. The Finance Committee is responsible for recommendations to the Board of Trustees. A participatory budgeting model creates a structured dialogue between the Subcommittee and the administration. The current mandate of the Senate Budget Review Committee is a retrospective role. Now, the Principal presents a budget proposal to the Board which it may not accept. So, the model does not usurp or replace the current decision points but rather provides a academic voice in differential decisions.

B. Palk observed that improved integrated planning and overlap between the Board and the Senate could mark the beginning of a journey to better governance. However, she expressed concern that it may seem that trustees were assuming an operating and management role, when their role is fiduciary, and this could compromise trustees. It might be better if the membership were strictly management.

Principal Woolf noted that the raison d’être of UPC is as a planning committee not an operational committee.

Chancellor Dodge pointed out that the UPC is intended as a bridge of information and that should not compromise trustees. The UPC must be alive to Senate academic boundaries, Board of Trustees fiduciary boundaries and management boundaries. Trustees must be careful not to insert themselves in management or academic operations. This can only be accomplished if trustees are informed and understand academic and financial consequences, and vice versa. The UPC is a good and important initiative to preserve the respective roles. The key members would be the Chair of the Board Finance Committee, the VP(A) and Provost, and the VP(Finance and Administration). It may be that the Budget subcommittee does not fit well in the concept. It will be important to avoid any confusion between operations versus information and planning.

Principal Woolf agreed that the Budget subcommittee could be free standing from the UPC. It was included in the UPC proposal because budget and planning are two sides of same coin. Effective planning cannot occur without awareness of short, medium and long term budget implications. The UPC would consider proposals in some detail, but bring forward recommendations for decision by the Finance Committee. In the wider community, and particularly among academics, there is a feeling of disengagement from the budget process and concern that the budget is developed top down without sensitivity to academic programs and academic needs. The UPC proposal provides an opportunity for informed dialogue. A separate budget committee with clear links may be a better model.

B. Mitchell supported efforts to engage in early dialogue and suggested that the amount and the type of information provided may be at the root. He believed that a severely downsized Board of Trustees would be more effective and suspected that the Senate might struggle with the same issue. Linkage between the Senate and the Board is critical. Perhaps an annual joint meeting would cement the links. However, he had concerns about a committee with two heads reporting to the Board and the Senate and questioned whether this was the most effective way to ensure information flow back and forth. If UPC is about information, then are there enough senators and trustees on the committee – perhaps seven from each body is a good number. In his view, as an entrepreneur, B. Mitchell saw budget as a management responsibility. Rather than creating another committee, he proposed developing a better process from the ground up rather than the top down.

Principal Woolf noted that there would be approvals by the UPC, so it is not purely informational. For example, what is a good idea for one faculty, may not be in the interests of the university as a whole. In which case, the proposal would not move beyond the UPC, or at least would move forward without a positive endorsement. This is an important distinction between integrated planning and an informational role.
Trustees asked for more clarification of the UPC’s function as an advisory body versus a decision-making body and wondered about the practicality of the large number of members and the monthly frequency of meetings.

W. Young suggested that tracking effectiveness of the UPC over time and making adjustments in response would be an essential aspect.

At this point, the UPC proposal has been referred by the Senate to its Operations Review Committee and that committee will reconvene on January 13 to review comments made during the Senate’s November 26 discussion and comments today by trustees, transmitted by the Secretary. It is anticipated that SORC will make a report with recommendations back to the Senate, either in January or February. The Board is expected to further review the proposal, with any amendments, in March, or in May. Potentially, the UPC could be established effective July 1, 2010.

Trustees discussed whether they should engage directly with SORC about the UPC. It was suggested that a special session for both the Senate and the Board about the relative responsibilities that flow normally from a bicameral governance structure would be useful for both bodies.

The Principal thanked the Board for a very worthwhile discussion.

V OTHER BUSINESS – none.

VI ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 and Trustees went to the Queen’s Centre for lunch and tours of the new facility.