

**FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE  
FACULTY BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**A meeting of the Faculty Board was held by ZOOM on Friday, April 3, 2020 at 3:30 p.m.**  
(Meeting was delayed due to technical duties and began at 4:00 p.m. instead.)

**1. Adoption of the Agenda**

Moved by J. Fraser, seconded by M. Adams. Motion carried.

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

Moved by S. King, seconded: M. Mombourquette.

M. Chen asked to remove Item 9 from Omnibus report IV to be discussed separately from the rest.

J. Stephenson request to withdraw Item 8 from the Agenda.

J. Morelli questioned the appropriateness of reviewing Item 7 on the agenda since it was discussed in the previous meeting and does not seem to present substantial changes.

Offered a challenge to allowing that item on the current agenda.

Moved by J. Morelli, seconded by D. Beauchemin.

Discussion ensued. J. Morelli argued that according to the rules, an item cannot be brought back for reconsideration unless there is substantial modification. In his view, there is very little modification.

**Motion failed.**

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes**

None

**4. Arts and Science Undergraduate Society Report**

C. Perkins delivered her final report as Chair of ASUS

1. ASUS needs to make big decisions to stay afloat due to the cancellation of funding

2. Concerns in recent weeks include:

- COVID-19 affecting academics in the freezing or redistribution of marks. Students are no aware that they have options, or what those options are
- Worries about pass/fail on transcripts inhibiting access to graduate studies
- Future exams and assignments may not fulfill learning objectives.
- Disruption of campus life: students have been relocated which has afforded many challenges to academic life and continuity of classes. There are more options needed and it is hoped that instructors will make allowances for the consequences of those disruptions.

Q. J. Hosek: Are there concrete suggestions for the faculty to think about or implement?

A. C. Perkins responded that there is the option to freeze the weighting, and to redistribute weight.

Some faculty are cancelling final exams and redistributing those marks to optional final assessments. The pass/fail is seen as problematic.

L. Raptis indicates that students could be given more time,

J. Atkinson will inform on Administrative decisions. The due date can be postponed, but exam schedule must remain the same because of TA's.

E. MacDonald: Students could be given accommodations but should not push everything to the end. Individual considerations could be possible.

J. Hosek: Students should be able to discuss this with their professors. There should be a message sent out by the administration to encourage students to reach out for help and accommodations.

J. Stephenson: They can use the website to request concessions for up to three months.

J. Rose thanked C. Perkins for her work and congratulated her on setting the bar high for future students in that role. Everyone agreed.

## 5. Dean's Report

Details of the Dean's report can be found at: [www.queensu.ca/artsci](http://www.queensu.ca/artsci)

## 6. Question Period

No questions. (J. Rose removes Item 6 from the Agenda)

## 7. REVISED - Bachelor of Science (Life Science SSP, MAJ, GEN, MIN and Biochemistry SSP, MAJ, GEN, MIN) – Undergraduate Program – Major Modification Proposal

J. Stephenson moved “that the Revised Bachelor of Science (Life Science SSP, MAJ, GEN, MIN and Biochemistry SSP, MAJ, GEN, MIN) – Undergraduate Program – Major Modification

Proposal be approved.” Moved by J. Stephenson, seconded by R. Knobel.

Lengthy discussion ensues.

J. Stephenson explained that:

- 1) The motion seeks to create two separate pathways for the entry into Life Sciences and Biochemistry for incoming students.

1. Directly from High School

2. After first year as has been the practice.

Currently there are 350 Life Sciences students and 50 in Biochemistry each year. There will be no specified numbers at this time, but there will be 100 seats for students at the end of first year so they will have no trouble entering the program. Students want direct entry but there is currently no possibility for this. This change is to expand pool of applicants.

- 2) The problem to be solved is that applications for the Sciences are weak and that requires remediation. The current yield rate in Life Sciences and Biochemistry is that the ratio of student acceptance is 1 per 4.2 offers. In the Sciences it is currently 1 per 6 offers.

- i. Projections for 2020 appear to be worse. Lowering student averages will not resolve the problem, as that has already been tried. There is a fear that this move will take places from ArtSci as students may transfer to Engineering, etc. This has financial considerations. J. Stephenson believes this will shore up science.

- 3) Consultation: Concerns of Faculty Board were heard which is the impetus for the proposed hybrid. This will give students two opportunities. The administration met with all Heads of sciences to determine how to promote sciences and create a form of marketing.

### **Comments and Questions**

**R. Knobel** indicated he had voted against this motion in the February meeting because he thought it might weaken the Science program. He feels that the 100 spaces in the second year is a positive factor and believes this hybrid is a good solution.

**B. Reeves** questioned the effect of COVID-19 on this modification. The crisis may last longer than expected and no one know what is going to happen. He sees this move as a form of “hoarding”, being blind to the current situation.

**M. Mellon** (ASUS): Feels this process is undemocratic because this topic is at a meeting when students are no longer on campus and may not be able to attend to express their opinions. There is a feeling that Faculty as attempting to overwhelm the student population.

**L. Winn** commented to B. Reeves that this is not a question of hoarding. The end goal is to keep Science numbers the same. L. Winn also commented to M. Mellon that Life Sciences were told they could not vote but they came to this meeting to vote.

**J. Morelli** asked for insight into the thought process behind this motion. The response to this was that the Faculty of Arts and Science already has several direct entry programs. The model exists and is successful in not taking away the commitment for a foundational first year program. It just provides options. Students decline offers because there is no direct entry into programs, where other universities do. There is a need to diversify entry paths, creating different ways of coming to Queen’s.

**D. Beauchemin** raised concerns about students who choose science in second year. There may be problems getting into labs.

**J. Stephenson** responded that there is no move to change first year general plan, although there may be a curricular change in the future. There will be no duplication; this motion does not block enrolment of students.

**B. Crow** supports this motion fully and believes it can deliver more to more students.

**N. Vorano** calls the motion. Seconded by Member Ferguson. Motion requires a 2/3 majority to pass. Vote is 76 to 45. Motion failed.

**J. Mingo** questions why the yield rate in the sciences (1 student per 6 offers) so low?

**C. Coupland** indicates that Western and McMasters offer specific first year rather than a general first year, which seems to be more popular.

**J. Fraser** indicated that J. Stephenson made a strong case that a new approach is needed but being like other institutions is not the solution to the problem. Queen’s is first in student satisfaction regardless. He feels this proposal is opening a kind of class system and that other solutions would be more helpful.

**M. Adams** loves the proposal and suggests the Deans should make the call. It seems that contemporary students want direct entry programs and prefer institutions with direct entry programs.

**S. King** believes that the proposal needs more work, that it is irresponsible to make a decision of this magnitude at this time.

**B. Cumming** stated that, like R. Knobel, he voted against the motion last time, but believes it is positive.

**P. Taylor** agrees with member Fraser that there is a problem, but that Queen's now has an opportunity for something better. He believes that students in Life Sciences and Biochemistry are already the best. There is a need for taking time to talk about doing things differently from other institutions.

**P. Evans** agrees with having two entry processes. Students no longer want a general first year program but direct entry into programs they choose. They want to "get to the point". There is a need to evaluate incoming students with something like an SAT.

**K. Pike** comes from a direct entry program and believes that perhaps it could be limited to a trial period before it is established permanently. Details can be addressed after a trial period.

**J. Stephenson** indicated that the Dean has committed to a two-year review to be reflective on the process and see how it works. The hybrid model incentivizes curriculum to be non-transferable and students will need to be able to meet prerequisites in other programs. There is strong interest in keeping pathways open.

**Question called:** 96 for to 43 against with 6 abstentions. Motion carried.

**8. Revisions to Admissions Criteria (QA & QS) for 2020**

J. Stephenson moved "that the revisions to admissions criteria be approved for 2020."

Approved

**9. Curriculum Committee Omnibus Report Part IV**

M. Chen moved "that the Omnibus Report Part IV be approved."

Moved by M. Chen, seconded by S. Mackenzie. Entire report with the exception of #8, which will be a separate motion.

Q: Member Vorano: Have these all been previously approved?

A: Yes.

Motion carried 110 to 0.

Item # 8 was set aside in the interest of time.

**10. Report of the Nominating Committee**

Moved by P. Fachinger, seconded by J. Morelli. Motion carried 103 to 0

**11. Report of the Academic Orientation Committee**

J. Mennell will present.

For information only. C. Perkins indicated the very hard work that the students put into creating the plan for Orientation Week 2020. J. Mennell also pointed out that the plans are up in the air because no one knows yet what will happen in the fall.

**12. Academic Progress Report - Academic Year 2018-2019**

J. Stephenson will presented.

This is the annual report of statistics on Academics: probation, appeals, withdrawals. It shows a three-year trend to give context for current statistics.

Vote held to continue meeting at 6:00PM.

Moved by M. McKenzie, seconded by D. Beauchemin. Motion failed (not a 2/3 majority)

Meeting ended at 6:00PM.

NB: Item #8 in the Curriculum Committee Omnibus report was never dealt with.

B. Crow indicated that COVID-19 updates with continue with town hall meetings.

**13. COVID-19 – Update**

B. Crow will update.

**14. Other Business**

J. Mennell, Secretary  
Faculty Board

J. Rose, Chair  
Faculty Board