United Way Appeal (D. Gordon) (CEO of United Way Kingston was called away at the last moment). Thank you for your generosity. 74,000 people were helped, and 61 agencies received grants. One of these was the Kingston Indigenous Languages Nest (KILN). Constance Carriere-Prill spoke representing the works done by KILN.

Land Acknowledgement was given by Jonathan Rose.

J. Morelli: Challenges the ruling of the Chair provided at Appendix D in the Agenda, the Chair breaks down the ruling into three reasons: 1. Jurisdiction, 2. Process and 3. Precedent. This is in regard to a motion I submitted in due process which I will address below.

As far as this jurisdiction goes, it is clear from this policy that the Faculty Board may bring in various policies and boundaries around the Dean’s consultation, however that’s not what’s being proposed in my motion. It does not propose the dean make a decision one way or another, it continues to recognize that the decision rests with the dean. Rather, the motion asks for Faculty Board to be given an opportunity to be consulted meaningfully and to convey its collective wish to the Dean.

This should be an iterative process and not just a one-time thing. (For full text see Appendix E in the Agenda)

J. Rose: Member Morelli, I will ask you to keep your comments just to the three points.

J. Morelli: I’m done, so I am challenging the ruling of the chair. The proper question should be those in favour of sustaining of the ruling of the chair.

J. Rose: There are a lot of students here, and it is impossible to let a teaching moment go by. Disagreement is fundamental to the university; it is the hallmark. So I appreciate Professor Morelli suggesting respectfully that he disagrees with this decision and I may have got it wrong. It is important to recognize that collegial governance is being done here by the very fact that these are important decisions taken by colleagues. Let me respond quickly to these points. The jurisdictional issue is that Faculty Board must be consulted. Good governance requires recognition of different levels of authority. Jurisdiction is important, and I have consulted the Senate guidelines. The Senate is the academic body that rules the institution about the obligations. The second thing is the process. I’m feeling quite confident in the decision that to have a discussion about what is the product of this discussion is to put the cart before the horse. In essence, the motion is asking the judge what he is thinking prior to the judge rendering a decision. In this case, the dean will come to a decision after hearing all the evidence gathered in the process. The decision will take place in December’s Faculty Board meeting.

I understand that member Morelli indicates that there is faculty precedence, and he is right. I reached out to the engineering faculty because it is the most recent and in several communications Member Morelli has lauded the process as one we should emulate. I sought out the chair of the engineering Faculty Board and I asked him to walk me through the process, then shared with him what we are doing and asked him if he thought we were doing anything offside with what they did. He assured me that it not only followed Senate guidelines but was arguably more robust than the engineering guidelines. It appears, Member Morelli, is the amount of consultation and your motion doesn’t really increase the amount of consultation. On the contrary, it is taking up time that we have devoted to consultation in this meeting. So I’m not sure that if this motion passed it would actually change the amount of consultation. The motion to challenge the chair will be posted. Either you support the challenge to the ruling or you support the FAS chair’s ruling which is found in Appendix E. Only eligible members of Faculty Board may vote. The challenge has been support by 57% of the people so the challenge is sustained and we will put the motion on the bottom of the agenda. We will move the motion to Item 15.

J. Morelli: A point of personal privilege. While appreciating the outcome of the vote, what I appreciate even more is seeing democracy in action. We can disagree with one another, but we have to do it in a collegial way. I wish to apologize to member Remenda for naming her in a manner that suggested I was impugning her work while she was the interim program director of the BFA. This was not my intent. Indeed the record is clear.
Member Remenda made substantive progress towards implementing many of the CPR recommendations during her tenure as interim director. I wish to set the record straight and apologize unreservedly.

J. Rose: Thank you, we will move on to Item 1 on the agenda which is the adoption of the agenda.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Moved: S. MacKenzie  
Seconded: Member Winn  
Motion carried

2. Approval of the Minutes as amended

Minor Modification: Insert Member Hussein  
Moved: M. Hand  
Seconded: Member Winn  
Motion carried

3. Arts and Science Undergraduate Society Report:

Masking
- With the University’s announcement of encouraging indoor masking due to the rising rates of respiratory illnesses, ASUS is redistributing our remaining masks from last year

Orientation & Community work/involvement
- Officially hired Head Gael, Georgia Dean-Savage who will be spearheading and welcoming the incoming class of 2027!
- Alzheimer's Outreach run, saw great attendance by students with donations raised for Alzheimer's research
- Wrapping up Community Outreach week, 11 committees raised funds for their respective local partner charities and engaged with students about community work and giving back!

Advocacy

Academics
- Deans X DSC – Thank you to the Associate Deans for your willingness and time in engaging with the DSCs and student leaders. Associate Dean guest speaker at ASUS Assembly. Student leaders were very eager to engage in thoughtful conversation!
- UGxDSC - November 22nd from 3-5pm in the Agnes. All are welcome!
- Thought Exchange – Assessing 2nd, 3rd, & 4th year students experiences, with support from Wendy Craig – looking forward to sharing in January 2023

SVPR
- Hosted first SVPR Inter-Faculty Coalition with student leadership across other faculties
- Attended consultation with the external reviewers from CCLISAR for the Sexual Violence Policy review. Focusing on student centred input by collaborating with Student Affairs and the Conduct Office.

Life After ArtSci 2022
- Professional Development team invited 30 students to Toronto on November 3rd!
- Special thanks to Penguin Random House, Queen’s Park, and OMERS Ventures for hosting us. And Queen’s alumni & the FAS Advancement office for making this possible
- Commenced planning for the winter 2023 trip to Ottawa

ASURF
- Applications for Fall 2022 have closed. Good engagement from applicants. Winter 2023 applications will be opening in week 3 of the winter semester.

Grants
• Professional Development Grant
• Student Initiative Grant
• Committee Grant
• DSC Grant
• Sibling Society Grant

Looking ahead
• Good Times Diner – Increasing to 10 meal services/month
• Equity Week – Throughout week 11
• UGxDSC – Tuesday November 22nd from 3-5pm in the Agnes Etherington
• November 29th – ASUS Open House at 183 University Avenue

4. Written Reports:

4.1 Dean’s Report
• Two weeks of classes left
• Provost’s reminder to use masks
• Notes are not required for missing classes
• School of Urban and Regional Planning just celebrated 50 years +
• Life After ArtSci was excellent
• November 1 enrolment count: We met our domestic undergraduate enrolment numbers, but we did not meet our international ones and we have had a decrease in our graduate numbers. We will do a deep dive and share that with you.
• Right now the university is just beginning to commence its offers and we have strong applications
• We’ll be releasing the FAS Annual report for the next Faculty Board.

4.2 Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) Report
• Written report available at ArtSci website

4.3 Associate Dean (Academic) Report
• I have no report at this time but as the Dean promised I will provide an enrolment update at the next meeting when the numbers are final

4.4 Associate Dean (Research) Report:
• Written report available at ArtSCI website. Highlighted a grant writing retreat on December 20 for Faculty Members
• Also inviting everyone to share the Tier 2 Canada Research Chair. The links are in the written report.

4.5 Associate Dean (Graduate) Report
• Continuing to review enrolment at the Grad level, especially domestic, and how to market more effectively
5. Faculty of Arts and Science – Faculty Board 2022-2023 Meetings (December 2022- April 2023) – for approval. Move that “the Faculty of Arts and Science – Faculty Board meetings for 2022-2023 (December 2022-April 2023) continue remotely.

Moved: M. Frasier
Seconded: J. Morelli Motion carried


Moved: J. Stephenson
Seconded: S. Mackenzie Motion carried

7. 2023-2024 Academic Sessional Dates – Appendix B – for information
J. Stephenson will discuss the 2023-2024 ASC Academic Sessional Dates

8. Name Change - Departmental of Classics -- for information
The Department of Classics is applying to SCADP and Senate to change its name from Department of Classics to Department of Classics and Archaeology.

D. Lehoux, Chair of Classics, explained that by unanimous decision the members of the department and the DSC wish to change the name from the Department of Classics to the Department of Classics and Archeology. This is simply to recognize what we really do as a department. Over half the faculty are archeologists. We have an unusual amount of active digs in 4 countries; we have 3 directorships of archaeological digs. This is unusual in Canada. Also, the archeology stream of our graduate program is a strong attractor for students and we want to recognize that. We have a new non-language stream in Classics which is unique in Canada. We are not only a Humanities Department but with archeology we are also a Social Science department. Students don’t usually know what “Classics” means, and this will attract more to the program.

9. Notice of Motion: “Be it resolved that programs in the Department of Classics be renamed to program in Classics and Archaeology so that the following programs be renamed:"
   a. Classics – Master of Arts, to be changed to:
      Classics and Archaeology – Master of Arts
   b. Classical Studies – Major (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts (Honours), to be changed to:
      Classics and Archaeology – Major (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
   c. Classical Studies – Joint Honours (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts (Honours), to be changed to:
      Classics and Archaeology – Joint Honours (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
   d. Classical Studies – Minor (Arts), to be changed to:
      Classics and Archaeology – Minor (Arts)
   e. Classical Studies – General (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts, to be changed to:
      Classics and Archaeology – General (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts
   f. Classics – Specialization (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts (Honours), to be changed to:
      Classics and Archaeology – Specialization (Arts) – Bachelor of Arts (Honours)

10. Report of the Nominating Committee – Appendix C – for approval
P. Fachinger will move “that the Faculty of Arts and Science Committee Membership attached be approved.”

Moved: P. Fachinger
Seconded: L Winn Motion carried
11. Question Period

Q. S. Lind: There seem to be fewer study days than usual. The reduction causes headaches for performance exams. Are other departments concerned? Can we have some influence on this?

A. J. Stephenson: Yes, this is a change moving into alignment with other faculties. It does shrink study dates. Any activities during study dates must be approved annually. The Exams office is looking into compressing the exam days to create more of a buffer zone. J. Stephenson indicated that she would like feedback from other departments so she can understand the scope of what is going on.

Q. Member Knobel: April 8, 2024 there will be a total solar eclipse in Kingston. This is the last day of classes in that academic year. Can the last 2 or 3 hours of that day of classes be moved in some way so people can take advantage of this event?

A. J. Stephenson: That is an awesome idea. Send me a memo and I will send it to SCAD-P which is where the sessional dates get approved.

Q. J. Benard: Is there any change to the Academic consideration process regarding the final exam?

A. J. Stephenson: No there is no change to the academic consideration. There will be no need for medical notes. The students can use the attestation form.

12. Consultation on the question of temporary suspension of admissions to the BFA Visual Art Program—Appendix D

Larry Graham is the consultant hired to facilitate discussion around the issue:
- There have been eight sessions since October 18
- Also there have been other submissions
- There is a thought-exchange open until November 30, 2022
- The FAS Dean has had an open door policy for anyone who wishes to discuss this option privately
- The questions to be asked are in Appendix D
- Purpose is to help explore the issues in a transparent way
- Ultimately FAS is hoping to retain the program Explains how the consultation was initiated by Warren Mabee, Interim Director of the program and John Pierce, Vice-Provost Teaching and Learning
- The recommendations for temporary suspension stem from concerns over how the existing BFA program is taught, what Visual Arts courses are offered and how those courses are organized.
- These concerns are raised by students and faculty within the program
- Also provide time for much needed renovations to the physical facilities to create spaces for future program changes
- Upcoming CPR may create risks for the program
- The concerns is more comprehensive than simply resolving the problems indicated in the 2016 CPR
- What we are doing today is to help you explore the issues in a transparent, anonymous way
- Ultimately, the FAS is seeking a positive future for Visual Arts teaching and learning
- To guide the process there are three broader questions, each with its own subquestions
- FAS leadership is only here to listen to your thoughts
- Today’s consultation a) will help develop a strategy for evolving Fine Art instruction at Queen’s, and b) determining what resources will be required, including space, to support this vision
- My job is to ask questions to this facilitative discussion
- FAS leaders are only here to listen, not answer questions or contribute to the discussion
- Guidelines: The consultation will last one hour; individuals are to make their points in 30 seconds or less, the consultant asks the questions, and the FAS leaders will not respond to questions
- All contributions will remain anonymous and will be included in the consultant’s report as such
- There is no recommendation being made for the scope of this initiative
• I will be asking questions, let’s stay on point

J. Morelli indicated that he felt this process was insulting
J. Rose indicated that Mr. Graham was to facilitate an open discussion
L. Graham indicated that all contributions should be kept short and to the point.
J. Morelli indicated that if the consultation takes an entire hour, then there will be no discussion of Appendix E as mentioned earlier since the meeting will have exceeded its time limit.
The consultation will end at 5:30.
J. Morelli: This is not a proper consultation. We’re in the dark. We don’t know what has already been proposed, we have no access to the report. Why are we not being provided with the information?
L. Graham: My mandate is to compile; the comprehensive document is not yet written.
J. Stephenson: All consultation with be collated and shared with members of FAS and Faculty Board.

Consultation Comments (anonymous)

There were several points made during the consultation process which are summarized below:

• Several members objected to the process as outlined above by the facilitator. There were questions as to the methodology of the process and many expressed the belief that these questions, as asked, were not appropriate and could only be answered by those involved in the program itself and those in cognate departments. Those from outside disciplines would not have the knowledge of the program curriculum necessary to answer the kinds of questions posed. That’s why there is little feedback at this time. Members don’t have the expertise to answer the questions.
• Several members indicated that the faculty and students involved in the program felt under threat because of the previous temporary suspension of admissions. The sense of a threat is not conducive to the open discussion required for making positive change. This is particularly so for students who are afraid that anything they say might be taken as a reason for suspending admission. The pressure of suspension is inhibiting changes to the program.
• There was a sense in discussion that the members felt that this process was not really addressing the impact and the possibility of alternatives. There was concern that Faculty Board had not supplied sufficient information about previous proposals and discussions, and what has already been done for the program. Members felt they were being asked to “reinvent the wheel”.
• There was insufficient knowledge as to what has happened since the previous temporary suspension, and the 2016 CPR, and its conclusions. The process of reimagining the program has only begun to take place recently.
• The students are a testament to the quality of the program: two have received major awards and the graduates are sought out by international programs. Every program has room for growth, no matter how strong they are. The question to discuss here is really about resources and commitment to the program rather than suspending admission temporarily.
• Members questioned why we were discussing changes in curriculum when the crux of the issue is really about the temporary suspension and its impact on the university.
• Members also questioned what the process was for coming up with these questions. It was felt that it would be more useful to discuss what the majority of people are actually interested in providing input.
• It was generally felt that a temporary suspension would not facilitate the changes required. What is required is support for the program and time to implement the changes indicated in the CPR. The sense is that it would actually do the opposite of supporting the program.
• The morale of students is very low, what with being online for the two years of COVID and the threat of the suspension of admissions. There is a strong sense that the program will not survive a second temporary suspension. In order to revitalize the program at this time, new students with enthusiasm and new ideas would help.
• It was stated repeatedly that the Faculty Board members would like to be able to hear the proposals of alternatives to the suspension in order to discuss those more fully. There has been no information provided on that.
• That information is needed to be able to consider what the impact on cognate departments will be, as well as equity goals in the program. It was also suggested that we were not provided with the goals, and what we are being consulted on.
Ultimately there is no promise that the suspension will provide the resources and no guarantee that the program will move forward.

Specific Consultation ended.

J. Morelli was concerned about time constraints as we have less than 18 minutes left for the rest of the agenda if we continue with the consultation.

J. Rose stated that the meeting can extend to 5:30, ruled that the consultation continue on a plenary basis.

J. Morelli indicated that this is not genuine consultation, there is information lacking and we want to see some of the proposals offered to the FAS. The BFA made proposals in writing but we have not had a chance to see them.

L. Graham responded that they are still compiling information, there are no documents as yet.

J. Stephenson stated that the information would be collated, and a document will be sent to the FAS and Faculty Board at that time. BFA created a document, which they can share if they wish. These questions have been asked in all incidences of consultations. This was explained in the September Faculty Board documents.

C. Dobbie asked when we will be able to discuss Step #2 of the Senate Checklist.

J. Stephenson responded that people are keen to move on to Steps 2, 3 and 4 of the checklist. The Dean will address these in her report as part of her decision.

A McLean inquired if there will be an opportunity to consult about the alternatives proposed? This is need for a holistic, fully informed consultation. Other knowledge is needed.

E. Colvin suggested there be a poll on the matter.

J. Rose replied that it would not be appropriate and is not part of the consultation process. We’re still in the generative phase of the consultation.

C. Dobbie was interested to know how other members felt about this. This process is inadequate. How can we change this? Will there be an opportunity?

N. Vorano asked J. Stephenson if she was referring to a letter from the Art and Art History. What is this referring to? Should the joint letter be submitted for the record?

J. Stephenson indicated that this was not the letter she was referring to. That was crafted by members of the BFA program and handed directly to L. Graham. The letter N. Vorano is referring to is already in the consultation process.

Member Arauz stated that the BFA letter that was submitted after the first (and only) consultation unanimously opposes the suspension and outlines the potential impact.

C. Dobbie offered one last comment of concern about the timeline of this process. Students are already applying to the program, which involves the submission of a portfolio. There is not enough time to finish the consultation process adequately within the next month as these applications are coming in.

Member McLean reiterated their previous question as to whether or no there will be other opportunities for more consultation. They believe there should be consultation at every step and question why it is only done in Step 1. What about the other steps?
J. Rose thanked everyone for their input and guidance. Disagreement is fundamental to the university. There are still opportunities to provide input through the thought exchange and direct communication with J. Stephenson.

J. Morelli moved to extend meeting for 30 minutes to finish the items on the agenda. V. Remenda seconded the motion.
J. Rose asked how long the extension would last.
J. Morelli replied that it depends on when we do this.
J. Rose reminded J. Morelli that the motion requires a 2/3 majority to pass.

Motion Failed

Meeting adjourned at 5:30

J. Mennell, Secretary
J. Rose, Chair
Faculty Board
Faculty Board