Minutes
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Friday March 5, Saturday, March 6, 2010, 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.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by D. Woolf, Seconded by L. Cannon and agreed:

That the Board adopt the Agenda as circulated, with two amendments:
1. The Finance Committee will present an item on a proposed expenditure of planning funds for the Reactor Materials Testing Laboratory;
2. Pension Committee Chair B. Cannon will present an amended report from his committee; and with the provision that items 2-10 be approved or received for information by consent.

Consent

2. Approval of the Minutes of December 4/5, 2009 and December 17, 2009 (confidential) (Appendix A, page 1)

3. Naming Dedications (Appendix B, page 26)
Motion:
That the Board of Trustees approves the following naming dedications in recognition of philanthropy.

The dedication of the David G. Vice Student Support Centre on the third floor of Beamish-Munro Hall in recognition of the generous gift in support of Queen’s, and the Faculty of Applied Science.

The dedication of the Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP Classroom in the Faculty of Law in recognition of the generous pledge from Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP in support of Queen’s, and the Classroom Renewal Project in Macdonald Hall.

5. **Advancement Quarterly Report** (Appendix D, page 30)


   For information of the Board of Trustees:

   Change of name of the Faculty of Applied Science. Senate approved the proposal to change the name of the “Faculty of Applied Science” to the Faculty of “Engineering and Applied Science” effective immediately.

   Revisions to the SNOLAB Institute Constitution as approved by the Institute Board on December 17, 2009.

   Senate meeting dates for 2010-2011.

7. **Exit Poll**

8. **Financial Update** (Appendix F, page 41)

9. **International Centre Annual Report 2009**

10. **Committee Reports:**
    - Investment Quarterly Report
    - Pension Quarterly Report (Appendix G, page 50)

Regular

11. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

12. **Chair’s Report**

   The Chair welcomed C. Davis in her official capacity as VP (Finance and Administration) and welcomed back former Dean of Applied Science T. Harris in his new capacity as VP (Advancement) as of January 1, 2010. The Chair noted the successful, well-attended opening of the Queen’s Centre on January 15, 2010. Associate VP and Dean of Graduate Studies J. Deakin organized the official elements and A. Pipe spoke eloquently on behalf of the Board.

   Principal D. Woolf and the Chair represented Queen’s at a recent COU joint Board Chair-Executive heads meeting in Toronto. The discussion focused on pension-plan issues, and whether the Ontario government could give some solvency relief, as is being done in other provinces, to mitigate the pension shortfall. The Chair observed that there would be some strings attached. The provincial government’s Reaching Higher Program is coming to a close; growth has exceeded expectations in last two to three years and government funding hasn’t caught up. There was substantial discussion around the topic of funding-per-student falling well short of expectations. Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities John Milloy participated in some of the discussion about the challenges faced by Queen’s and its sister institutions. All of the topics were on table, including tuition and policy. It will be important to be resourceful in this environment of government constraint.

13. **Principal’s Report**

   The Principal participated in a conference call March 4 with AUCC executive heads and brought good news about the federal budget. Despite little new spending, the post-secondary sector did well. Although universities did not get everything they might have liked, the post-secondary education sector did well compared to others.
The Principal continues to think that the McGuinty government supports education. The latest indication was the Premier’s recent speech at a Toronto fundraiser, where he said he wants the province to be an “education mecca” to students from around the world.

Given Ontario’s $26-billion deficit, however, universities should not expect too much in the March 25 provincial budget announcement. At least 12 Ontario universities are struggling with deficits. All are dealing with a system-wide higher demand for post-secondary education and a dearth of new funds to support it. The Principal reminded trustees about what makes Queen’s Queen’s: academic excellence, including innovative world-class scholarship and research; a unique, inclusive teaching environment; service to local, national and international communities.

The Principal has made Academic Planning a priority in his first year in office. He launched the process last January with a vision document that was circulated to the entire Queen’s community. The document, which has elicited lively and constructive discussion, outlines how the University can move forward; by staying true to its core values, recognizing its strengths and using imagination to be more efficient and effective. The document, among other matters, has been discussed at length in the Principal’s visits to academic departments (14 to date), at a student symposium and at an interesting breakout session at the January 28 Senate meeting.

Academic planning has started in academic and non-academic units. It is also the topic of the May 1 University Council annual meeting. An academic team will develop the draft academic plan over the summer. It will be revised over the fall, based on consultation with the University community, for presentation to the Board at its December meeting.

He thanked new VP (Finance and Administration) C. Davis and Associate VP (Finance) D. Janiec for their work on budget planning. The in-year projected deficit for 2009-2010 has been reduced from $8.3 million to $4.7 million. This is due mainly to:

- the one-year wage agreement reached with the Queen’s University Staff Association (he thanked the staff association for its leadership);
- additional provincial funding for graduate growth;
- reduced utility costs.

The real crunch will come in 2011-12, unless the province offers some operating relief, or tuition is allowed to increase. Both are unlikely. Undergraduate program offerings will diminish and graduate funding will be at risk. Quality as well as accessibility is at risk, due to increasing demands on student aid. Decisions must be made with the whole University in mind.

Fundraising is key. VP (Advancement) T. Harris is developing a strategic plan for Advancement. This year’s fundraising stands at $48.8 million – a 58-per-cent increase over last year’s total.

The Principal called on VP (Academic) P. Deane to give an operations update. VP Deane noted that deans, directors, department heads and VPs have a challenging budget task ahead, given the significant financial restrictions faced by the University.

The province is adopting a new Quality Assurance framework to streamline the introduction of new programs into universities. Institutions have until the end of this calendar year to comply with policy. The new system will force universities to adopt a new process of inquiry and self-reflection.

The University’s administrative structure will change May 1 with the VP (Academic) assuming additional organizational responsibilities as University Provost. The Office of the VP (Academic) has been working with the Office of the Principal and other units to prepare for the change. It will optimize the model by reviewing areas of responsibility, current and future staffing needs and other resource allocations.

On February 18, Senate approved changing the name of the Faculty of Applied Science to the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science. Many potential students do not equate “applied science” to
“engineering” and the name change was needed to clarify this. Many applied science faculties in the U.S. encompass nursing, rehabilitation and applied medical sciences.

VP Deane reported that History professor A. Husain, was recently appointed Director of Educational Equity and Diversity Projects. He and a small team are assessing the diversity reports tabled at Queen’s over the last two decades. He and the team will report their findings to the Queen’s community on March 25.

The University signaled its commitment to environmental sustainability and global climate change on February 9, when the Principal signed the University and College Presidents’ Climate Change Statement of Action for Canada.

Earlier in March, the University joined counterparts from across the country to support Project Hero – a scholarship program created to provide financial support to children of soldiers killed in combat or peace-keeping situations. The new award will be available to one Queen’s applicant annually starting in September, 2010 and will cover four years’ tuition plus room and board in the first year.

VP Deane noted the Retirees’ Association of Queen’s, whose members support to the University in tangible ways, including chairing theses defences and conducting other important work. Their help goes a long way in assisting departments in tight financial times.

14. Question Period

15. Student Affairs (Appendix H)

Chair welcomed alumnus J. Macmillan who served as AMS President in 2006-07, during the early development work of the Queen’s Centre.

The Chair thanked the outgoing AMS executive for their contributions, and introduced the winners of the recent election. He noted the reference in the AMS report on page 60 of the agenda, specifically the importance of respect and collegiality in working relationships. This “grease” helps to maximize the impact and the value of the ideas that students bring to the table. The Chair noted an unusual circumstance, that the current AMS executive will still be officially on the job at the next Board meeting on April 30. The Chair congratulated the incoming AMS executive, President S. Chowdhury, VP (Operations) B. Hartley (not present) and VP (Student Affairs) C. Rudnicki.

The Chair thanked V. Bae for her service as SGPS President and welcomed new President Jawad Qureshy, whose term starts April 1.

The Chair thanked graduate student trustee A. Nocilla, whose term ends May 31, and introduced his successor, B. Grant.

The Chair recognized outgoing Rector L. Jackson as a tireless contributor to the Board and to several committees. He noted that her superior judgment and opinion is valued by the trustees and that she will be missed. He welcomed her successor, N. Day.

a) Rector – (page 58)

The Rector referred to her written report and continued to encourage access to municipal tap water. She encouraged the Principal to go water-bottle free. She comment on the recent student symposium in Wallace Hall to discuss the Principal’s Academic Planning exercise and noted that attending to equity issues is an underlying component to any planning.
b) **AMS President (page 59)**
The AMS President noted that all AMS events are water-bottle free. It is the AMS’s consensus that the Queen’s Centre is worthy of commitment. He expressed his concern about the lack of support of the Centre by the SGPS and noted that the issue at hand is for the two groups to share the same vision. There cannot be a strong student community at Queen’s without a student centre serving the entire community. (speech included as part of the minutes)

c) **SGPS President**
The SGPS President applauded the Principal on his recent signing of the University and College Presidents’ Climate Change Statement of Action for Canada. Eighty-two per cent of the membership opposed the Queen’s Centre capital contribution fee. The new executive and university will have to work together to work together to arrive at a solution. (speech included as part of the minutes)

II COMMITTEE MOTIONS AND UPDATES

1. Finance Committee

   a) **Goodes Hall Expansion – Final Project Approval**

      Moved by B. Palk seconded by M. Daub and agreed:

      That on the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustees approved the Goodes Hall Expansion Project (Appendix I, page 61)

   b) **Masters of Management Program Fee (Appendix J, page 63)**

      Moved by B. Palk seconded by J. Del Missier and agreed:

      That on the recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustees approved the Masters of Management Program Fee set out in Table 1 below:

      | Master of Management - Global Degree | Actual 2009/10 | Proposed 2010/11 | % Change |
      |-------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------|
      | 12 month single degree              | Domestic      | $22,990         | $24,024  | 4.5%     |
      |                                     | International | $34,485         | * $36,036| 4.5%     |
      | 16 month double degree              | Domestic      | $30,305         | $31,668  | 4.5%     |
      |                                     | International | $45,457         | * $47,502| 4.5%     |
      | 20 month double degree              | Domestic      | $35,530         | $37,128  | 4.5%     |
      |                                     | International | $53,295         | * $55,692| 4.5%     |

      | Master of Management - Finance Degree | Domestic | n/a | $29,500 - |
      |                                      | International | n/a | $44,250 - |

      | Masters of Management – Accounting Diploma (Note 1) | Domestic | n/a | $5,000 |
      |                                                     | International | n/a | $7,500 |

      * Fees previously approved at December 4/09 Board meeting.
10-07

c) Reactor Materials Testing Laboratory (handout)
See report attached to minutes

Moved by B. Palk, seconded by L. Jackson and agreed:

That on recommendation of the Finance Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the expenditure of $200,000 in planning funds for the Reactor Materials Testing Laboratory. These funds exist within the VP (Research) portfolio.

2. Investment Committee (Appendix K, page 66)

a) Approval of Spending Policy and Payout

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

That on recommendation of the Investment Committee, the Board of Trustees approve the Spending Policy and Payout as indicated on page 67.

Pooled Endowment Fund
For fiscal year 2010-2011, the payout from the Pooled Endowment Fund should be 11.51 cents per unit. This is the payout derived from a modification of the Yale spending formula, and is approximately 7.8% below the 2009-2010 payout of 12.49 cents per unit.

Unrestricted Funds
There should be no separate policy for the payout rate for the General Endowment portion of the Pooled Endowment Fund. A previous motion of the Investment Committee was approved in January 2009; this motion provided for a higher payout from these assets. However, given the poor returns in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, the administration recommended that this motion be rescinded in order to help preserve the capital value of the Pooled Endowment Fund for the future.

Pooled Investment Fund
The withdrawal from the Pooled Investment Fund around the end of April, 2009 should be the same formula as the previous three fiscal years at 7.5% of mean assets.

Funding for the Office of Advancement
For the fiscal years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, the continuation of allocations to the Office of Advancement from the Pooled Endowment Fund to compensate the revenues foregone due to the elimination of the 5% gift tax on donations to the University.

10-08

3. Committee Updates

Finance Chair B. Cannon drew attention to a typographical error in the Pension report. (page 50, first sentence of the third paragraph). The Queen’s pension fund returned 2.7 per cent in fourth quarter and was up 18.6 per cent for the calendar year. The Chair noted that it was a great year for the pension plan.

Campus Planning and Development Chair D. Burns noted that the most substantive item the committee dealt with at its meeting that day was a review of the Campus Plan document. Adopted as a policy by the Board in 1994, it is normally reviewed every five years. The Board adopted a revised plan in 2002. Senior administrative personnel changes in ensuing years contributed to the delay of the latest review. The committee is working on collecting base data for a future master plan, but will not know what options it will be bringing to the Board until the Academic Planning process is over. The committee noted a spike in construction prices in 2008, but they are now starting to come down. It will keep track of these carefully.
III CLOSED SESSION
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IV SATURDAY, March 6, 2010

1. **Board of Trustees’ Responsibilities under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities legislation**

VP Morrison introduced Accessibility Coordinator Jeanette Parsons, who introduced trustees to the legislation.

PowerPoint presentation is attached to minutes.

2. **University Planning Committee** (Appendix M, page 79)

See PowerPoint presentation, UPC Proposal from the Senate Operations Review Committee for discussion by the Board of Trustees, March 6, 2010, attached to the minutes.

Senators attending: P. Oosthuizen, B. Pardy, T. Lin

D. Woolf noted this was the Board’s second look at the University Planning Committee (UPC) proposal, after a useful discussion at the December 6 Board meeting. Issues included:

- The shape and composition of the UPC
- UPC’s role and relationship with Senate and the Board Finance Committee
- Some concern about the budget subcommittee proposal

The Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC) continued to refine the proposal at meetings January 13 and February 10. A further discussion at Senate followed on February 18.

D. Woolf noted the preferred timeline for approval of the UPC proposal:

- A final revision by SORC on March 10, 2010
- Passage by Senate on March 25
- Recommendation to the Board of Trustees on April 30
- UPC to be populated over the summer in order to participate in the academic planning process this fall

D. Woolf reminded trustees that the UPC proposal is now a document of Senate and not of the Principal.

D. Woolf invited J. Stairs, Chair of SORC, to describe the review process to date since the proposal was first made public in October 2009.

J. Stairs noted the following:

- The need to be clear about the role of the budget committee – should it be a subcommittee?
- What is the role of the UPC as a decision-making authority? What is its actual jurisdiction?
- The original UPC proposal and membership was formulated based on that of another university. It is important to look at Queen’s requirements – what would be a maximum number of members and would also be truly representational?
- Confusion about the role of the UPC budget subcommittee and the authority of the Board Finance Committee
- The need for the authority of Senate and the Board to remain unchanged with UPC providing a bridge.

J. Stairs noted that, at the February 18 Senate meeting, most concerns were about composition rather than the UPC mandate or terms of reference. Senators were still concerned about the large size of the UPC (19-20) and the lack of an explicit role for the Deans, who share a considerable responsibility for
the budget. SORC assumed that VPs and Deans could be included on the committee through the election process of faculty senators. The Chancellor was dropped from the composition because of the participation of the Vice-Chancellor (the Principal). J. Stairs said that some Senators who have served on the Senate Budget Review Committee feel strongly that their work is retrospective and not meaningful, and that involvement in the budget committee during the budget development process was more important.

The Principal noted that he and the Board Chair see this exercise as part of the larger process of governance review, which began with the introduction of the Provost model (approved by the Board December 6, 2009).

The following observations about the UPC were recorded:

Meeting frequency
- A bi-monthly meeting (instead of the original monthly meeting) schedule is preferable.
  Technology (video and teleconferencing) is available to allow participation without attending in person and would also promote sustainability (lessening carbon footprint.)

Size and composition
- As with senators, trustees said that the UPC membership was still too large to function effectively and needed to shrink
- Many Board and Senate committees have functioned well with about 20 members. J. Stairs noted the cap of 20 would ensure a workable number of members in attendance
- Many trustees (as well as Senators) say the UPC is still too large to be effective. A smaller, leaner UPC can make higher-quality decisions and serve a powerful role in enhancing the information flow between Board and Senate
- V. Bae suggested a pared-down committee of six to eight members, including the Provost, Principal, Board Chair, one staff member, one faculty member and one student, possibly the chair of the Board’s Finance Committee, and another trustee or senator at large if no faculty, staff or student member were on the committee
- Trustees said it was not necessary to have an equal balance of Senate and Board membership and were agreeable to having fewer trustees on the UPC
- A working budget committee needs to be established, but not necessarily as a subcommittee of the UPC
- Trustee M. Campbell and AMS President M. Ceci repeated their point made at Senate that the Option A composition enables either the graduate or the undergraduate student senator to serve continually because they are elected in opposing years. One solution would be that the student is elected to a one-year term, which would compromise experience on the committee
- A. Nocilla noted the need for more student representation on the committee and that student society executives might be better suited to contribute than some of the student trustees.

Mandate and process
- Trustees welcomed the amendment of “review and approve” to “review and comment.”
- In response to I. van Nostrand, D. Woolf said that the intent of the UPC is to bridge the gap between management and governance without blurring the distinction between them. The UPC is a management committee in the sense it is a funnel for ground-level planning discussions; a review before getting into the full governance mode of committee structure.
- B. Palk questioned if the Board will continue to play an oversight/stewardship role or will the UPC execute the strategy of the Board and Senate through a set-length planning process or are the Board and Senate going to combine strategy?
- W. Young noted that some decisions with financial implications that the University has made over the years flew under the radar of the Board’s Finance Committee. For example, the decision to increase enrolment. It was not that the strategy was wrong, but rather that the Finance Committee did not catch it. The Principal noted that new academic programs are referred to the
Senate without fully noting the financial aspects attached to them. Now, these proposals will go to the UPC first to allow trustees and senators to comment and raise questions.

- To I. van Nostrand’s concern that the UPC would be so powerful that any proposal would be “99-per-cent baked” by the time it got to Senate or Board, D. Woolf suggested including a report from the UPC as a standing item on the Board’s Finance Committee agenda.

- J. Stairs noted that the University budget would be delivered to the UPC in a timely manner so Senate – and the Board’s Finance Committee – could comment on it before it went to the Board for approval.

- D. Woolf noted the trustees on the UPC will have an early look at what is on the horizon and that fiscal planning will be in the mix at an early stage. Trustees are not bound to vote yea or nay on the committee; when items get to the appropriate Board committee they are free to accept or reject the UPC’s advice. It would not compromise a trustee’s ability to speak out as they would at a Board meeting.

- Trustees suggested that trustee chairs should sit as elected members on UPC because of their deeper knowledge, and that second-year student trustees or senators be chosen to sit on the UPC for the same reason.

- Trustees agreed that the UPC proposal should have a sunset clause of two or three years to see if it is working and incorporate a review of the structure.

- D. Dodge disagreed with J. Nesbitt’s idea of University Council participation on the committee. The key is to ensure that Senate does the Academic Plan and that the financial aspects are incorporated in its development. This is a practical way to make both bodies work better. This ensures that the academic plan is of the University and not of those of us from the outside. It’s practical and we need to get onto it very quickly. The UPC will require resources and funding, which should come from the Principal’s Office.

- L. Cannon noted that frequently, informal structures more powerful because of their access to information, they can steer debate. She cautioned that this body should not be directing the flow of information that gets to the other bodies. The introduction of the UPC will encourage increased use of the University’s institutional planning unit.

V OTHER BUSINESS – none.
VI  CLOSED SESSION
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VI  ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12.05 pm.
AMS President M. Ceci’s speech

It took three years of consistent AMS executive, assembly and faculty society executive leadership and community information dissemination and discussions to have the AMS community to arrive at the consensus that the Queen’s Centre vision was worthy of student financial commitment. That vision included facility renewal and (perhaps more importantly) the development of a student community centric Student Centre – it is now 5 years later and meaningful Student Centre development is still stalled.

The focus, while discussing the AMS vs. SGPS capital commitment on “the pay to play” while accurate, does not fully address the issue at hand. The issue is about sharing a vision and fairness between students’ commitment to their institution and the broader student community. The financial commitment of the SGPS members is not actually that critical to the facility operations nor for that matter the QC project, but is a very fundamental indicator of intent and commitment both to the success of the Student Centre and to their fellow students at Queen’s.

The overriding “truth” is that there cannot be a strong student community at Queen’s without a Student Centre and that a significant portion of the broader learning experience that is a quintessential part of the Queen’s experience would be lost without a Student Centre serving the entire student community. The majority of students of that community, as represented by both student governments, are fully aware of that; as are the University administrators. And while the quality and quantity of student centre facilities are important- Student Centre Development and success has more to do with how well programs and experiences come together and are facilitated – and the resulting impact on individual and communities of students.

The AMS attempted to keep this “big picture” at the forefront when establishing the fundamental conditions (hence a commitment and not a donation) for the AMS students’ support (financial and otherwise)- Most will not remember that the SGPS and AMS executives shared these objectives and the commitment at the beginning of the journey toward the QC project (in Andre’s & Chrissie’s year).

Three fundamental conditions were consistently discussed in the student community and with the Administration through 5 years of prior dialogue and then in detail during negotiations surrounding the wording of the Commitment Memorandum of Agreement. Based on these understandings, students gave their commitment and the University administrators accepted it. These, “deal-breaking/making conditions were:

1. Facilities: That the Queen’s Centre-based Student Centre facilities would be better than the ones replaced, AMS program elements would be made whole, and there would be some enhancements to the space and facilities – this of course is now in abeyance and resulted in Assembly directing that the remaining AMS commitment be put in trust until the project is restarted.

2. Operations: That the governance and administrative model would be student-government centric (like all the other student centers across the country) – this was the “good faith” clause and was intended to, provide students with more ownership over the outcomes and resources of the student centre, to reduce overall operating costs and enhance utilization of the facilities—-this was subverted and stonewalled by some university administrators, who have fortunately now all ingloriously departed the scene.

3. Financial: That the debt charges related to the QC project would not accrue to AMS students before their capital commitment was fully provided-- unlike the previous iteration of the student centre where the University’s promise to match student funding for the student centre was debt financed with the principle and interest passed on as operating charges for the JDUC (which students paid about 50%) from 1978 to 1998 @ $100,000 per year.

Discussions of governance are more appropriately related to organizational and constituent commitment to provision of programming, activities and services provided to the campus communities- than to the facilities from which they are provided. That the majority of this governance responsibility falls on the undergraduate students of the AMS should not be a surprise or obstacle given the predominate capacity and constituency of the undergraduate student government on this campus (and most other campuses). That reality does not subvert the SGPS’s governance responsibilities and obligations or for that matter the University’s—it does however point the way to relating Student Centre leading and supporting governance roles.
We can anticipate that implementation, transition and the evolving practices; policies and agreements will take some time to work out into a satisfactory overall student Centre operating agreement led by the AMS. Even for universities and student governments who have this relationship firmly in place – it usually takes about two years to just renew the student Centre operating agreement. You have the option now to make this a work in progress rather than an interminably stalled squabble. It is not acceptable to wait for perfection or agreement on the development of the Student Centre – students deserve to get the best experience from their Student Centre, while at Queen’s now. Let’s make this happen as soon as possible.

SGPS President V. Bae’s speech

As a sustainability-oriented individual, and as a member of the great Queen’s Community, I applaud the Principal for the recent signing of the BC Commitment. I also wish to echo the Rector and the AMS President in urging Principal Woolf to soon announce Queen’s to be the first bottled water free campus in Canada.

SGPS had its annual election and referendum on February 17th and 18th of this year. All positions have been filled and will be installed next week at the March SGPS Council meeting. Many of our new members are present tonight. Please welcome Jawad Qureshy, the new SGPS President and Benjamin Grant, new SGPS Student Trustee.

Soon after I was elected, the SGPS Executive had a meeting with the Principal to discuss the possibility of the SGPS making a capital commitment to Queen’s Centre Project. As per the University’s request, the Executive and Council took this initiative to our membership at this past referendum. This fee failed to be established with 82% of voters voting against.

I wish to clarify that this referendum result does not bespeak the SGPS membership’s apathy at the University’s financial difficulty. The SGPS Council had an exhaustive discussion on this issue over 3 meetings, and all sides of matter have been covered. The membership felt dichotomously on the fundamental issue of the fee. I can assure you that while there are some of us who disagreed with the fee in principle, there are as many of us who supported the fee in principle. I am a student who believes that while students should be the top priority of any academic institution, students should make it their priority to contribute to the school in times of difficulty.

Then what does this referendum result mean? It means that the SGPS membership reacted strongly against the approach that the Administration has taken in this fee drive. The negotiation initially started in a positive atmosphere with promises of benefits to the membership in return for this crucial contribution, but for some reason it turned into a quite aggressive discussion on what the membership may suffer as a consequence of opposing this fee. The SGPS Executive takes the referendum result as an indication that, for this initiative to have more success in the future, the SGPS and the Administration have to work together more diligently to resolve conflicts, not the least of which is the Queen’s Centre governance and alienation of graduate and professional students on campus.

Lastly, I wish to express my gratitude for the warm welcome the Board has given me, and the excellent working relationship the SGPS has seen with the Board for the past 6 months. Best of luck to Jawad and Ben, the new Rector and new AMS Executive team in the upcoming year.
The Reactor Materials Testing Laboratory (RMTL):

The RMTL will simulate nuclear reactor conditions using accelerator technology (rather than a test reactor), allowing more economical and far reaching testing of current and advanced materials (see Appendix A for more details).

This Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) project is led by Professors Richard Holt and Mark Daymond (Materials and Mechanical Engineering), has a total estimated capital cost of $17.5M, and has received research funding approvals in a highly competitive environment. The proposal included the following capital expense breakdown: $9.57M (55%) to equipment, $7.17M (41%) to building including construction, shielding and services, and $0.75M (4%) to licensing and training.

The CFI award is accompanied by $2.1M to help offset operating costs.

Background:

- Submission of project was approved by the Queen’s CFI Executive Committee June, 2008, including a matching Queen’s contribution of $1.62M. (Committee members in attendance were K. Rowe, P. Deane, A. Simpson, R. Deeley, S. Marlin, and S. Wood).

- Project approved by CFI June 2009 ($7M) and by the Ontario Ministry of Research and Innovation (MRI) July 2009 ($7M).

- Required matching funds of $3.5m will consist of $1.62M cash from Queen’s and $1.88M in eligible vendor discounts.

- The VP (Research) will contribute the $1.62M in matching funds from the CFI matching account (War Chest); note that current War Chest funds will cover this commitment, but that additional funds, as requested in the VP (Research) budget submission, will be needed to meet matching commitments for all CFI projects approved June 2009.

- Servicing/planning study of the sites was commissioned from HDR/Mill Ross Architects by Queen’s in September 2009.

- CFI guidelines indicate that permit-ready drawings and “shovel in the ground” are expected by December 2010; however, as construction is not likely to start until spring 2011 an extension will be sought and, based on past experience, is expected.

- Up to $800k of the Queen’s matching funds will need to be spent to hire a) consultants to undertake work related to Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) licensing requirements and b) architects to prepare construction drawings, prior to submitting budget finalization documents to CFI for review and approval; only after this second stage CFI approval stage will CFI and MRI funds begin to flow.
Both the Innovation Park and Grant Timmins Drive were considered as options. Grant Timmins Drive is the recommended option:

Grant Timmins Drive:
- Grant Timmins is a 4 acre property, just south of the 401, in the small Clyde Industrial Park.
- The specified RMTL use (i.e. laboratory) is permitted under the current zoning for this property.
- Grant Timmins already has all major services on site, hence the lower servicing costs.
- Grant Timmins requires Site Plan Approval, given the age of the original plan and the scale of alteration to the original plan.
- The property is located near a high school.
- The Property is currently being used by the Faculty of Applied Sciences for research projects and for the Queen’s Waste Transfer facility which provides temporary storage for radioactive materials used on main campus and which require stabilization prior to final disposition. Physical Plant Services also stores construction material such as limestone at this site.

Finance Committee Motion:
That the Finance Committee recommend to the Board of Trustees approval of an expenditure of $200,000 in planning funds for the Reactor Materials Testing Laboratory. These funds exist within the VP (Research) portfolio.

Board of Trustees Motion:
That the Board of Trustees, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee approve the expenditure of $200,000 in planning funds for the Reactor Materials Testing Laboratory. These funds exist within the VP (Research) portfolio.
Appendix A
Outline description of Queen’s CFI Reactor Materials Testing Laboratory

Materials behave quite differently in a nuclear reactor environment than in conventional applications. The differences are due to the presence of radiation fields, comprising fast particles and high energy electro-magnetic waves. Historically, in order to understand the impact of the reactor environment on material properties, researchers have carried out experiments in a ‘Materials Test Reactor’. The Queen’s facility will investigate such materials’ issues using an alternative approach, based on the use of accelerator technology to simulate dynamic reactor conditions.

The infrastructure thus includes a 4MV tandem accelerator and associated materials characterization equipment (e.g. TEM, SEM) to be housed in a new dedicated building comprised of an accelerator hall, control room, services, laboratories for specimen preparation and characterization, and working space for researchers.

Similar accelerators are widespread in universities with machines housed at, for example U. Montreal, U. Western Ontario, U. Ottawa, U. Guelph and U. Toronto. The U. Montreal accelerator is of an even higher energy than the Queen’s facility (at 6MV). The Queen’s facility differs from these other universities’ facilities principally in that our facility will deliver a combination of moderate voltage combined with high current (number of particles) to the target. However, by far the largest fraction of comparable accelerators in Canada are, in fact, found not in universities, but in hospitals where they are used both for diagnosis and treatment (including KGH). All of these accelerators are governed by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC), as Type II Nuclear Facilities (c.f. the reactors at McMaster and RMC which are Type I Nuclear Facilities). For such infrastructure, CNSC requires submission of the machine design, training and safety procedures at two stages 1) prior to construction of the building and 2) prior to start of operation. CNSC then requires regular reports as to machine operations.

Accelerators can produce radiation in two ways. Firstly, the actual acceleration of particles produces radiation fields which are only present while the accelerator is on, i.e. turning off the accelerator instantly makes the radiation disappear. Secondly, if high enough energy particles hit a target sample, it can become radioactive. However: a) this radioactivity is much much lower than the levels found in a reactor, and b) the isotopes will decay to background levels rapidly – on timescales comparable to the isotopes already in common use on the Queen’s campus. The equipment will therefore be usable by suitably trained graduate students. We also plan to have two full time staff members trained in radiation safety.