

## **1 General Principles**

## **2 Governance**

- 2.1 Consensus and Decision-Making Procedures
- 2.2 Student governance
- 2.3 Diversity of participation
- 2.4 Membership on committees
- 2.5 Committee Chairs
- 2.6 Co-chairs
- 2.7 Decision-making process
- 2.8 Attendance and quorum
- 2.9 Minutes and agendas
- 2.10 Conflict of Interest
- 2.11 Confidentiality and In-Camera Sessions
- 2.12 'Fast-Action' Procedures

## **3 Steering Committee**

- 3.1 Steering Committee overview
- 3.2 Steering meeting procedures
  - 3.2.1 Responsibilities of the chair of Steering
- 3.3 Appointment, renewal, replacement, removal of chair of Steering
  - 3.3.1 Initial Appointment of chair of Steering
  - 3.3.2 Renewal of Steering chair
  - 3.3.3 Expiry of Steering chair
  - 3.3.4 Removal of Steering chair
  - 3.3.5 Acting Steering chair

## **4 Program Director**

- 4.1 Responsibilities of Program Director
- 4.2 Appointment, review, replacement, changeover, removal of Program Director
  - 4.2.1 Qualities and skills required of the Program Director
  - 4.2.2 Initial appointment of Program Director
  - 4.2.3 Renewal of Program Director

- 4.2.4 Expiry of Program Director
- 4.2.5 Removal of Program Director
- 4.2.6 Acting Program Director

## **5 Program Coordinator**

- 5.1 Responsibilities of Program Coordinator
- 5.2 Qualities and skills required of the Program Coordinator
- 5.3 Appointment, review, replacement, changeover, removal of Program Coordinator
  - 5.3.1 Initial appointment of Program Coordinator
  - 5.3.2 Renewal of Program Coordinator
  - 5.3.3 Expiry of term of Program Coordinator
  - 5.3.4 Acting Program Coordinator

## **6 Program Administrator**

## **7 Standing Committees**

- 7.1 Admissions Committee
  - 7.1.1 Duties of the Admissions Committee
- 7.2 Curriculum Committee
  - 7.2.1 Duties of the Curriculum Committee
- 7.3 Communication and Recruitment Committee
  - 7.3.1 Duties of the Communication and Recruitment Committee
- 7.4 Cultural Studies Unit REB (CUST UREB)
  - 7.4.1 Duties of CUST UREB
  - 7.4.2 Composition
- 7.5 Constitution Committee
  - 7.5.1 Mandate of the Constitution Committee
  - 7.5.2 Duties of the Committee
  - 7.5.3 Duties of the Chair of Constitution Committee
  - 7.5.4 Membership
- 7.6 Standing Intellectual Development Committees
  - 7.6.1 Community Based Research and Action (COBRA)
  - 7.6.2 Research Creation Committee

7.6.3 Research Creation Committee Mandate

7.6.4 Awards Committee

7.6.4.1 Awards Committee Mandate

7.6.5 Ad-Hoc Committees

## **8 Revisions & Self Evaluations**

**This Draft: April, 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

## 0. Purpose and scope of the document

This document pertains to the establishment of core principles and decision-making processes within the program, and to the mandates and responsibilities of standing committees and administrative positions.

Policies and procedures pertinent to the various committees are maintained by those committees as per the mandates described in this constitution.

### *0.1 Abbreviations*

Throughout this document,  
PA refers to Program Administrator  
PD refers to Program Director  
PC refers to Program Coordinator

## **1 General Principles and Procedures**

As an interdepartmental program, and in keeping with our objective to integrate and synthesize a number of different theoretical and practical approaches within Cultural Studies, it is important to provide students and faculty with a strong sense of their membership in a community of scholars and practitioners who share a common focus. The building of such an intellectual community requires that students and faculty members have regular opportunities to engage with each other on formal and informal levels.

### **2 Principles**

Therefore our governance is guided by two main principles. First, all who are going to be affected by a decision should have a real say in making that decision. Therefore, all committees are open to anyone involved in the program, including student, faculty and staff unless in cases of conflict of interest, or where freedom of information/protection of privacy laws or guidelines apply. Second, our decision making procedures are guided by consensus with a deadlock-breaking mechanism. This means that instead of voting and majority rule, one person can block a decision, in a context where all participants are working towards an outcome that everyone can live with.

## 2.1 Consensus and Decision-Making Procedures

Each committee functions on an explicit consensus basis. Decisions are made by ‘impure consensus’ i.e. consensus with a deadlock breaking mechanism. This ensures that all opinions, ideas and concerns are taken into account: “Through listening closely to each other, the group aims to come up with proposals that work for everyone. Consensus is neither compromise nor unanimity - it aims to go further by weaving together everyone's best ideas and key concerns - a process that often results in surprising and creative solutions, inspiring both the individual and the group as whole.” (<http://www.seedsforchange.org.uk/resources>)

A decision is made by asking each member of the group to signify assent, dissent, or abstention. A decision passes if there are no dissenting voices.

If consensus cannot be reached after two meetings at which the same issue has been discussed, then:

- (i) any member can call for a vote to go to deadlock-breaking, which requires a 75% majority.
- (ii) the deadlock-breaking vote is then held immediately, and also requires a 75% majority.

The chair of each committee aids the group in defining decisions that need to be made, helps them through the stages of reaching an agreement, keeps the meeting moving, focuses discussion to the point at hand, makes sure everyone has the opportunity to participate, and formulates and tests for consensus.

The chair helps to direct the **process** of the meeting, not its **content**. They never make decisions for the group. If a chair feels too emotionally involved in an issue or discussion and cannot remain neutral then they should ask someone to take over the task of facilitation for that agenda item.

The chair also acts as a ‘vibes-watcher’ who observes and comments on individual and group feelings and patterns of participation, with attention to how various relations of power might be playing out in the room.

Even though the chair formally takes on these roles, all participants in a meeting should be aware of and involved in the issues, process, and feelings of the group, and should share their individual expertise in helping the group run smoothly and reach a decision. This is especially true when it comes to finding compromise agreements to seemingly contradictory positions. ([actupny.org/documents/CDdocuments/Consensus.html](http://actupny.org/documents/CDdocuments/Consensus.html))

## 2.2 Student Governance

Cultural Studies at Queen’s is committed to the idea that student governance must be a creation of the students themselves. That is, this document can only outline how, we hope, students relate to the other elements of our community. It cannot, and does not, attempt to legislate on matters of internal student governance.

Since all committees (except Admissions) are open to all students in the program, students can decide for themselves how to participate in them. They can, for example, send representatives, allow open participation, or some combination of these, or other options.

As part of their duties, committee chairs, the program director, and the Program Administrator are responsible for sending out requests for students to be on various Standing and Ad Hoc committees.

### **2.3 Diversity of Participation**

In order to enable as many people as possible to be involved in the governance of the program, we strive to ensure that those who are occupying paid administrative positions (e.g. director, program coordinator) are not also teaching core courses in CUST. We also strive to ensure that the same person does not hold more than one of the paid positions, and that one individual does not teach more than one of the core courses at a time.

### **2.4 Membership on Committees**

Faculty, staff, and students who wish to sit on standing committees are expected to make a one-year commitment in the name of continuity of the group.

### **2.5 Committee Chairs**

Each committee has a faculty chair, who is a member of and appointed by the Steering Committee. The chair of each committee recruits for their own committee and endeavours to secure adequate diversity of representation from faculty, staff, and students. All committees may also have a student co-chair.

The chair of every Standing Committee is automatically a member of the Constitution committee.

If a chair loses the confidence of their Committee or of the Steering Committee, e.g. by failure to adequately consult, failure to carry out their duties, or through a violation of the Collective Agreement, they may be removed at any time by a decision of the Steering Committee. When such a decision is being discussed, the chair has voice but not vote.

### **2.6 Co-chairs**

When it is both possible and desirable, the job of committee chair may be split between two people, e.g. one student and one faculty member. At least one of the co-chairs must be a faculty member. A student co-chair is desirable when possible, to extend and embody the participatory decision-making valued in the program. The student co-chair is chosen by consensus vote of the given committee.

The responsibilities of the co-chair, when there is one appointed, from some subset of general chair responsibilities. They are to be discussed between the chair and co-chair.

The word "chair" in the sections below and elsewhere should be understood to mean "chair or co-chair."

## 2.7 Decision-making Process

At the first meeting of each new academic year, the committee chairs ensure that all members know and understand the decision-making process.

All members of Standing and Ad Hoc committees are encouraged to read the section on General Principles and Procedures and Appendix 1 (below) for further info on consensus governance in general and our model in particular.

## 2.8 Attendance and Quorum

All members of a committee have both 'voice' and 'vote', i.e. are able to speak and participate in the consensus-building process.

Anyone not a regular member can attend any meeting, with 'voice' but not 'vote'.

In the case of remote participation, it is the responsibility of the remote member to make communication arrangements.

There is no maximum on membership of a committee.

Quorum for all committees, including Steering, for all sorts of decisions, is 50% of the membership, including the chair, plus one person. When the number of members of a committee is odd, the fraction resulting from multiplying by 50% is rounded down.

## 2.9 Minutes and Agendas

Agendas for each committee are created by the chair of the committee, or in the case of the Steering Committee, by the chair in consultation with the program director.

Items are solicited from all members, and agendas are distributed electronically to all members prior to the meeting.

Each committee keeps in mind the desire for institutional memory of its proceedings and reports its activities to Steering on a regular basis.

## 2.10 Conflict of Interest

In cases where specific members or a particular group of members may be seen to be in a conflict of interest, or where freedom of information/protection of privacy laws or guidelines apply, they may excuse themselves, or be asked to excuse themselves, from a discussion. Such decisions must also be reached through the regular consensus-building procedures.

## 2.11 Confidentiality and *In Camera* Sessions

On occasion, there may be reason to keep conversations confidential for a period of time. It is the responsibility of the chair to initiate a conversation about this when need arises.

Any committee may hold *in camera* sessions if there is consensus to do so. Discussions held *in camera* are permanently confidential, and are not mentioned in the minutes; they are open to only members of the committees. Such sessions must be justified on the basis of confidentiality or special sensitivity of the material to be discussed.

As above, in cases where specific members or a particular group of members may be seen to be in a conflict of interest, or where freedom of information/protection of privacy laws or guidelines apply, they may excuse themselves, or be asked to excuse themselves, from an *in camera* discussion. Such decisions must also be reached through the regular consensus-building procedures.

### **2.12 'Fast Action' Procedures**

In situations that require immediate action, i.e. where it is not practicable to wait for the next scheduled Steering Committee meeting, or to call a special meeting, the chair of Steering may, in consultation with the program director if possible, send out an email to all members of the committee requesting their input on a given question. The chair of Steering sets a deadline for responses, and takes into account all responses that arrive before the deadline, as though this were a consensus decision being made by the Steering Committee.

## **3. Steering Committee**

### **3.1 Steering Committee Overview**

The Steering Committee is the primary decision-making body of the Cultural Studies program. In the case of a conflict between the wishes of the Steering Committee and any other committee or holder of a position, including the Director, the Steering Committee's decision supersedes.

The responsibilities of the Steering Committee include, but are not limited to:

- Setting and reviewing long-term goals and priorities
- Responding to program director requests for advice in 'fast action' situations
- Organizing the self-evaluation and governance review
- Ensuring the sustainability and well-being of the program
- Approving faculty requests to join the program
- Allocating unallocated or unperformed administrative tasks

The Committee meets monthly at a regular time, or with a regular rotation of times to ensure maximum participation of interested members of the community.

The program director (PD) is always a member of the Steering Committee, but cannot be the chair of the Steering Committee.

The program coordinator (PC) is always a member of the Steering Committee, but cannot be the chair of the Steering Committee.

The program administrator (PA) is always a member of the Steering Committee, but (like all staff) cannot be the chair of the Steering Committee.

The chairs of all Standing and Ad Hoc committees are always members of the Steering Committee, and can be chair.

As is the policy for other committees, any member of the CS community may choose to sit on the Steering Committee as long as they commit to a one-year period.

Once a year, normally at timetabling season, the program administrator puts out a call for members of the Steering Committee in the following academic year to all faculty, staff, and students. In the fall, students newly entering the program are invited to participate.

### **3.2 Steering Meeting Procedures**

Those submitting agenda items for consideration are responsible for providing adequate time for members of the committee to look over any documents they would like to be considered, by email to the steering chairs and program director at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Without such notice Steering reserves the right to defer discussion to a future date.

Minute takers and agenda-setters are responsible for sending the appropriate documents to the program administrator in a timely fashion. Agendas and other committee documents are open to all Cultural Studies members; the PA ensures that documents are made available as appropriate for all faculty, staff, and students involved in the program to view.

#### **3.2.1 Responsibilities of the chair of Steering**

A central responsibility of the chair of the Steering Committee is to promote and defend a culture of consensus within the committee, and beyond that, in the program. The chair of Steering pays attention to long-term issues and interpersonal dynamics, encouraging all members of the committee and CS community to work productively together towards the overall flourishing of the program. The chair of Steering is expected to become thoroughly familiar with the CS Constitution and with our principles and practices of consensus decision making (see Appendix 1 for resources).

The chair of Steering's other responsibilities include:

- In consultation with the PD, PC, and PA, scheduling meetings, collecting and generating agenda items for each meeting, and sending the agenda to the PA at least two days prior to the meeting;
- Facilitating the meetings of the committee in keeping with our principles and procedures for consensus-based decision-making;
- Chairing the Constitution Committee;
- Ensuring that all standing committees have chairs;
- Speaking for Steering as necessary to various constituencies and acting as an advocate for Cultural Studies, as an intentionally alternative space within Queen's University;
- Ensuring the scheduling and planning of an annual retreat;
- Arranging a special meeting of Steering each September entirely devoted to ensuring that all members on the committee are familiar with the principles and procedures of consensus that we use to make decisions;
- Helping to resolve conflict of interest situations (See section 2.10);
- Initiating conversation about confidentiality when need arises;

- Initiating, organizing, and ensuring the completion of searches for program director and program coordinator. If a subcommittee of Steering is struck to carry out such a search, the chair of Steering will be the chair of that subcommittee (See 4.2; 5.3; 7.6.5).

A student co-chair, as desired, is appointed with the same process as the faculty Chair, except that the term is ordinarily one year. The job description is discussed between the co-chairs and proposed to the Steering Committee for approval within the first two months of the co-chair's appointment (or the first two months of the fall, if the appointment is in the spring).

### **3.3 Appointment, Renewal, Replacement, Removal of chair of Steering**

#### **3.3.1 Initial Appointment of chair of Steering**

The initial appointment is normally for two years, with the understanding that for various reasons another term may be suggested by either the candidate or the Steering Committee. The normal student co-chair appointment is only one year.

The term of the chair of Steering normally begins on July 1.

The procedure for the initial appointment of a chair or co-chair of Steering is as follows.

1) Six months prior to the end of the term of the current chair, the current chair of Steering sends out a call for nominations and self-nominations to all faculty, staff, and students associated with the CS program.

The call for nominations includes the responsibilities of the chair of Steering (3.1.8.1), and the nomination should address how the proposed candidate would be well-suited to fulfilling these. The deadline must be not less than 2 weeks from the date of the call for nominations.

2) Nominees must consent to their nomination in order to be eligible. After the end of the nomination period, the current chair of Steering determines whether nominees have consented to their nomination, compiles the eligible nominations, and distributes them to the Steering Committee, which meets to discuss their relative merits. Candidates who are currently members of Steering are not present for this discussion.

The Steering Committee may delegate the task of recommending a decision to an ad hoc subcommittee, which is chaired by the chair of Steering. This subcommittee presents a recommendation to Steering as a whole (except members who are candidates), which makes a final decision.

At the discretion of the Steering Committee or sub-committee, applicants may be asked to an interview. If one candidate is interviewed, then all must be interviewed.

3) After having satisfied themselves that they have enough information to make a decision, the Steering Committee chooses a candidate or candidates.

4) If no candidate can be chosen, either the process starts again immediately, the current chair is invited to seek renewal, or Steering appoints an acting chair and restarts the appointment process within six months.

### **3.3.2 Renewal of chair of Steering**

If an incumbent chair or co-chair wishes to continue for another term, the Steering Committee must review them and approve the renewal. In order to leave time to recruit and approve a new chair if necessary, the review should be completed no later than 6 months before the expiry of the current chair's term.

The process is as follows:

- 1) Steering chooses a member of Steering who is not the chair to coordinate the process. The Steering Committee may delegate the review to an ad hoc sub-committee. This subcommittee presents a recommendation to Steering as a whole, which makes a final decision.
  - 2) The coordinator of the review sends out an email to all members of the Steering Committee, requesting their help in evaluating the current chair. The evaluation is to be based on the responsibilities outlined in this document. Participants are also asked to frame their comments with attention to the context of the program, that is, where it has been, where it is, and where it might be going. The deadline for the receipt of all evaluations is two weeks after the call has been issued.
- Comments are sent, via email, to the coordinator of the review. The coordinator of the review summarizes the comments into a document by topic without names associated for consideration by Steering.
- 3) At the same time and with the same deadline, the chair of Steering is asked to submit a self-review based on the responsibilities outlined in this document and any relevant information about accomplishments or events during his or her tenure in the position.
  - 4) Steering then meets without the chair to review any documents received, and decides whether to approve the renewal or to seek a new chair.
  - 5) If a decision on renewal cannot be reached at this point, the coordinator of the review sends the materials and comments to the chair seeking renewal, who is then invited to a meeting with the Steering Committee to discuss the file. Once both the members of Steering and the chair seeking renewal have satisfied themselves that all necessary discussions have been completed, the Steering Committee tries to form a decision again, without the chair present.

### **3.3.3 Expiry of term of Steering chair**

If a current Steering chair does not wish to continue for another term, or has already served for three consecutive terms, then the process for selecting a new Steering chair begins.

### **3.3.4 Removal of Steering chair**

If the Steering chair loses the confidence of the Steering Committee, e.g. by failure to carry out their duties, they may be removed at any time by a decision of the Steering Committee. In making decisions of this sort, the current Steering chair has voice but not vote (i.e., cannot block a decision to remove themselves).

### **3.3.5 Acting Steering chair**

In situations of emergency or exigency, the Steering Committee may appoint an Acting Steering chair for the duration of the academic year.

In this situation, advertising may be limited to current members of the Steering Committee; however, Steering still formally discusses the candidate's suitability as per the "Initial Appointment" processes.

## **4 Program Director**

### **4.1 Responsibilities of Program Director**

The program director is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the program, accountable to the steering committee which is the ultimate decision making body. The director reports regularly to the steering committee and plays a central role in imagining future directions for the program and maintaining the intellectual environment of the program.

The specific responsibilities of the program director are to:

- Maintain a clear and timely flow of information and consultation with the Steering Committee, other Standing and Ad Hoc committees, and staff.
- Liaise with the School of Graduate Studies, the Faculty of Arts and Science, and any other relevant bodies at Queen's where our program needs representation.
- Attend university meetings such as Committee of Departments, Arts Council, and Arts & Science Faculty Board, or delegate attendance as necessary.
- Act as a source of information and guidance for students, and a liaison for faculty members in their roles as teachers, supervisors, and administrators.
- In consultation with Standing and Ad Hoc Committees, facilitate student recruitment, admissions, and progress through the program.
- Chair the Admissions Committee.
- Prepare funding packages for incoming and continuing students.
- Coordinate or conduct the ranking of student awards, and prepare letters of recommendation
- Work with other departments and programs to allocate TAs, RAs and TFAs to Cultural Studies students.
- Act as a mentor to the program coordinator.
- Manage the finances of the program and keep Steering Committee up to date on budgetary possibilities and constraints.
- Maintain membership in the Constitution Committee.
- Propose a budget each year for approval by the steering committee and report at the end of each term

It is important to note that the Director of Cultural Studies is not a Head of Department, as that position is defined within the Collective Agreement between Queen's University and the Queen's University Faculty Association. The primary difference is that while a Head of

Department has a certain amount of control over the Department, the Director of Cultural Studies is ultimately responsible to the Steering Committee. That is, in a conflict between the wishes of the Steering Committee and those of the program director, the Steering Committee supersedes.

## **4.2 Appointment, Review, Replacement, Changeover, Removal of program director**

### **4.2.1 Qualities and Skills Required of the Program Director**

During selection and renewal, preference is given to individuals who display the following skills and qualities.

- A significant record of involvement in CS affairs and administration
- A demonstrated commitment to maintaining collegial relations, and acting in the best interests of the program.
- A demonstrated commitment to the core values of the program, e.g. interdisciplinarity, consensus decision making, valuing cultural production in the same way as theoretical-academic interventions.
- Competence in areas of responsibility as outlined above.

### **4.2.2 Initial Appointment of program director**

As a Graduate Coordinator within the School of Graduate Studies, the program director is appointed by the Steering Committee. The initial appointment is normally for three years, with an option for renewal for a further two years.

The Steering Committee may delegate the task of recommending a decision to an ad hoc subcommittee chaired by the chair of Steering. This subcommittee presents a recommendation to Steering as a whole, which makes a final decision.

The procedure for an initial appointment of a program director is as follows.

1) Once it is determined that the current PD's term is expired, he or she has not been renewed, or does not wish to continue in the position (ideally 9 months prior to the end of the term of the current PD), the chair of Steering sends out a call for nominations, via email, to all faculty, staff, and students associated with the CS program.

The call for nominations includes a list of the responsibilities of the PD and skills and qualities expected, and the nomination should address how the proposed candidate meets these criteria.

Self nominations are acceptable.

The call for nominations must provide a deadline not less than 2 weeks from the first call, and not more than 4 weeks.

2) After the end of the nomination period, the chair of Steering compiles the nominations and disseminates them to the members of the Steering Committee, who meet to discuss their relative merits.

3) At the discretion of the Steering Committee, applicants may then be asked to come for an in-person interview. If one candidate is interviewed in this way, then all must be interviewed as well. Skype or another similar program is an adequate substitute for face-to-face presence when necessary.

4) After having satisfied themselves that they have enough information to make a decision, the Steering Committee chooses a candidate.

If there is only one candidate, that candidate must still be formally approved by the Steering Committee.

5) If no decision can be made, the process may start again or Steering can proceed to select an acting program director.

6) The goal of this process is to make an appointment at least 2 months prior to the end of the previous PD's term.

#### **4.2.3 Renewal of program director**

If the incumbent program director wishes to continue for a second term of two years, the Steering Committee conducts a review initiated by the chair of the Steering Committee and then makes a decision about the renewal.

The Steering Committee may delegate the task of recommending a decision to an ad hoc subcommittee, which is chaired by the chair of Steering. This subcommittee presents a recommendation to Steering as a whole, which makes a final decision.

In order to leave time to recruit and approve a new Director if necessary, the review should be concluded by 3 months before the expiry of the current PD's term. The following timeline reflects this consideration.

1) Six months prior to the expiry of the current PD's term, the chair of Steering sends out an email to all CS faculty, students, and staff, requesting their help in evaluating the current PD. The evaluation is based on the Responsibilities, Qualities & Skills outlined in this document, which are included in the call for participation. Participants are also asked to frame their comments with attention to the context of the program, that is, where it has been, where it is, and where it might be going.

2) Comments are sent, via email, to the chair of Steering. The sender of all comments must be identified. Senders can, however, request that their name be withheld.

3) The program director is asked to submit a self-review using the same criteria.

The deadline for the receipt of all evaluations is one month after the call has been issued.

4) Comments are collated by the chair of Steering, then brought to a meeting or portion of a meeting not attended by the current PD. This meeting is minuted as usual. At the meeting, the members of Steering deliberate upon the materials collected via the review and attempt to come to a decision.

If a decision on renewal cannot be reached at this point, the chair of Steering sends a summary of materials and comments, fully anonymized, to the PD, who is then invited to a meeting with the Steering Committee to discuss the file. Once both the members of Steering and the PD have satisfied themselves that all necessary discussions have been completed, the Steering Committee tries to form a decision again, either at that same meeting, without the PD present, or at a different meeting, again without the PD present.

#### **4.2.4 Expiry of term of program director**

If the current program director does not wish to continue for a second term, or has already served for two terms, then the process for selecting a new program director begins.

#### **4.2.5 Removal of program director**

If the program director loses the confidence of the Steering Committee, e.g. by failure to adequately consult, failure to carry out their duties, or a violation of a relevant Collective Agreement, the Director may be removed at any time by a decision of the Steering Committee. In making decisions of this sort, the program director has voice but not vote.

#### **4.2.6 Acting program director**

The Steering Committee may appoint an acting program director when necessary, appoint an acting program director for a term of 6 months to one year.

The same procedure used for appointing a program director is followed; however, timelines may be made tighter as needed.

## **5 Program Coordinator**

### **5.1 Responsibilities of the program coordinator**

The specific responsibilities of the program coordinator are to:

- Plan and implement, with community consultation, CUST802, including both student workshops and public talks and events
- Manage the CUST 802 budget and report at the end of the academic year
- Act as alternate signature person on official program documents if the program director is unavailable
- Serve as an alternate for Committee of Departments, Arts Council, and Arts & Science Faculty Board, and other such university meetings
- Be involved in admissions, i.e. selection of students and negotiation of funding packages
- Be involved in scholarship ranking activities.
- Maintain membership in Steering and Constitution Committees

## **5.2 Qualities and Skills Required of the Program Coordinator**

During selection and renewal, preference is given to individuals who display the following skills and qualities.

- A significant record of involvement in CS affairs and administration
- A demonstrated commitment to maintaining collegial relations, and acting in the best interests of the program
- A demonstrated commitment to the core values of the program, e.g. interdisciplinarity, consensus decision making, valuing cultural production in the same way as theoretical-academic interventions
- Competence in areas of responsibility as outlined above

## **5.3 Appointment, Review, Replacement, Changeover, Removal of Program Coordinator**

### **5.3.1 Initial Appointment of Program Coordinator**

The initial appointment is normally for two years, with an option for renewal for a further year.

The term of the PC normally begins on July 1.

The procedure for the initial appointment of the program coordinator is as follows.

1) 6 months prior to the end of the term of the current PC, the chair of Steering sends out a call for nominations, via email, to all faculty, staff, and students associated with the CS program.

The call for nominations includes a list of the responsibilities of the PC and skills and qualities expected, and the nomination should address how the proposed candidate meets these criteria.

Self nominations are acceptable.

The call for nominations must provide a deadline not less than 2 weeks from the first call, and not more than 4 weeks.

2) After the end of the nomination period, the chair of Steering compiles the nominations and disseminates them to the members of the Steering Committee, which meets to discuss their relative merits.

The Steering Committee may delegate the task of recommending a decision to an ad hoc subcommittee, which is chaired by the chair of Steering. This subcommittee presents a recommendation to Steering as a whole, which makes a final decision.

3) At the discretion of the Steering Committee, applicants may then be asked to come for an in-person interview. At the discretion of the steering committee or ad-hoc committee, the shortlisted candidate may be invited for an interview. Remote connection is an adequate substitute for face-to-face presence when necessary.

4) After having satisfied themselves that they have enough information to make a decision, the Steering Committee chooses a candidate according to normal procedures regarding quorum and decision making.

5) If no decision can be made, the process may start again, or Steering can proceed to select an acting program coordinator.

### **5.3.2 Renewal of Program Coordinator**

If the incumbent Program Coordinator wishes to continue for a second term of one year, the Steering Committee must approve the renewal. As part of this process, a review is conducted by the chair of the Steering Committee, which solicits input from all students, faculty, and staff involved in the program. In making the renewal decision, the program director and program coordinator have voice but not vote (i.e. cannot block a consensus).

The Steering Committee may delegate the task of recommending a decision to an ad hoc subcommittee, which is chaired by the chair of Steering. This subcommittee presents a recommendation to Steering as a whole, which makes a final decision.

In order to leave time to recruit and approve a new program coordinator if necessary, the review should be started by 6 months before the expiry of the current PC's term. The following timeline reflects this consideration.

1) Six months prior to the expiry of the current PC's term, the chair of Steering sends out an email to all CS faculty, students, and staff requesting their help in evaluating the current PC. The evaluation is based on the Responsibilities, Qualities & Skills outlined in this document, which are included in the call for participation. Participants are also asked to frame their comments with attention to the context of the program, that is, where it has been, where it is, and where it might be going.

2) Comments are sent, via email, to the chair of Steering. The sender of all comments must be identified. Senders can, however, request anonymity, in which case only the chair of Steering will know who has sent them, i.e., the sender's identity is not divulged to anyone else. The chair of Steering has sole discretion to decide if anonymity is to be granted, although the bias should be towards allowing anonymity, unless there is clear evidence or awareness of aggressiveness, instability, or extreme bias such that the process will be compromised if the comments are passed on anonymously. In such cases the chair of Steering informs the sender that anonymity can't be granted in this case. The sender can then withdraw the comments, or ask them to go ahead without anonymity.

3) The program coordinator is asked to submit a self-review using the same criteria.

The deadline for the receipt of all evaluations is one month after the call has been issued.

4) Comments are collated by chair of Steering, then brought to a meeting or portion of a meeting not attended by the current PC. This meeting is minuted as usual. At the meeting, the members of Steering deliberate upon the materials collected via the review and attempt to come up with a decision.

If a decision on renewal cannot be reached at this point, the chair of Steering sends a summary of materials and comments, fully anonymized, to the PC, who is then invited to a meeting with the Steering Committee to discuss the file. Once both the members of Steering and the PC have satisfied themselves that all necessary discussions have been completed, the Steering Committee tries to form a decision again, either at that same meeting, without the PC present, or at a different meeting, again without the PC present.

### **5.3.2 Expiry of term of Program Coordinator**

If the current program coordinator does not wish to continue for a second term, or has already served for two terms, then the process for selecting a new Program Coordinator begins.

### **5.3.3 Removal of Program Coordinator**

If the Program Coordinator loses the confidence of the Steering Committee, e.g. by failure to adequately consult, failure to carry out their duties, or a violation of a relevant Collective Agreement, the Program Coordinator may be removed at any time by a decision of the Steering Committee. In making decisions of this sort, the Program Coordinator has voice but not vote.

### **5.3.4 Acting Program Coordinator**

The Steering Committee may appoint an Acting Program Coordinator when necessary, for a term of 6 months to one year.

The same procedure used for appointing a program coordinator apply; however, timelines may be made tighter to respond to situations of emergency or exigency.

## **5. Program Administrator**

The Program Administrator job description is managed under the appropriate CA. The PA is a voting member of the Steering Committee.

## **7. Standing Committees**

### **7.1 Admissions Committee**

#### **7.1.1 Duties of the Committee**

The Admissions Committee is responsible for selecting students to be offered positions within the program. The chair actively solicits membership, which is open to all faculty affiliated with the program, with no maximum. The chair also strives to get representation from as wide a variety as possible of departments, streams, theoretical, methodological, and political tendencies, and types of theses/projects.

Since Admissions decisions are confidential in nature, the details of the discussions of particular student files are not recorded.

## **7.2 Curriculum Committee**

### **7.2.1 Duties of the Committee**

The Curriculum Committee's duties include:

- Reviewing and updating, as necessary, the calendar descriptions for CUST courses;
- Reviewing and updating, as necessary, which courses should count as “core”;
- Determining who teaches the core courses, by soliciting interest from all affiliated faculty members before the end of the fall term, selecting from those who are interested (by soliciting and comparing cvs and ideas about the course), and making a recommendation to the Steering Committee. If no affiliated faculty come forward, then the Collective Agreement is triggered for the hiring process;
- Developing policy to facilitate students' enrolment in courses in other units;
- Periodically reviewing issues and policies concerning students' progression through the program (e.g. exams, thesis proposal process, supervision), in liaison with the Research Creation and Community-based Research committees, and ensuring that calendar language about the program is up-to-date.

## **7.3 Communication and Recruitment Committee**

### **7.3.1 Duties of the Committee**

The Communication and Recruitment Committee's duties include:

- Creating and maintaining content in all media, to advertise and promote the program
- Talking to students interested in the program, and acting as advisors to incoming students, especially international students.
- Receiving and evaluating Statements of Inquiry
- Answering emails from prospective students
- Being aware of the areas of expertise and interest of all CS faculty, since directing students to supervisors is crucial to the health of the program
- Encouraging and soliciting student participation on the committee
- Making a regular report to the Steering Committee as part of the section of the meeting devoted to reports from Committees.

Student members of the Communication and Recruitment Committee can view Statements of Interest and make recommendations to the Committee based on that evidence. Student representatives are responsible for circulating the statements of interest, which are provided to them by the Program Administrator.

## **7.4 Cultural Studies Unit REB (CUST UREB)**

### **7.4.1 Duties**

The CUST Unit REB is charged by the Queen's University General Research Ethics Board (GREB) with providing initial research ethics review for Cultural Studies research that involves human participants in accordance with GREB Policy – "Unit REB Policies & Procedures". The bulk of this work is carried out electronically, using the Queen's Human Ethics Application e-System (TRAQ). The CUST Unit REB meets on an as-needed basis to deal with non-routine applications or questions of general policy.

Other duties include:

- Raising the profile and understanding of research ethics issues and procedures among members of the CUST community.
- Making and revising ethics-related policies, to be approved by Steering and included in the CUST policy document.
- Presenting a regular report to Steering, via the chair of the Unit REB committee or delegate.
- Ensuring that appropriate expertise is available for reviewing applications, by maintaining and mentoring a pool of faculty and students who have done the training for ethics review.

### **7.4.2 Composition**

The CUST Unit REB includes at least one CUST Faculty Member as well as students and staff members as appropriate and available.

The chair is a faculty member, chosen by the Steering Committee.

The chair acts as the signing authority on the ROMEO system and liaises with GREB.

Student members contribute to the ethics review by reading the applications and providing comments through email and/or face to face meeting to the chair. The chair collates all of the comments, and provides them via the ROMEO system and/or in face-to-face meetings."

## **7.5 Constitution Committee**

### **7.5.1 Mandate of the Constitution Committee**

This committee crafts and reviews changes to the Constitution as needed, and generally is responsible for making sure the Constitution reflects current needs and practices.

### **7.5.2 Duties of the Constitution Committee**

The Constitution Committee is responsible for ensuring that the constitution is maintained and updated, through a process of dialogue with Steering and other Standing and Ad Hoc committees. The Constitution committee can propose changes on its own initiative, and act upon proposals/referrals from Steering or from other committees.

The Constitution committee is only responsible for producing and approving wording for consideration by Steering. The Constitution committee is chaired by the chair of Steering. Any changes to the constitution must be made at a meeting of Steering, using the normal consensus procedures.

Chairs of Standing Committees may choose whether to take proposals they have for changes to the Constitution either through the Constitution Committee or directly to Steering, depending on the complexity of their proposal or implications it may have for other parts of the Constitution. Consultation with the chair of the Constitution Committee is advised.

### **7.5.3 Duties of the chair of Constitution Committee**

The chair of the Constitution committee shall

- Set agendas for meetings, through consultation with committee members, keeping track of action items from previous meetings, and watching for items referred from other committees.
- Distribute the agenda, via email, along with relevant attachments, at least 24 hours prior to each meeting.
- Make approved changes to the “master” Constitution document, and ensure that the revised document is posted on the Cultural Studies website in a timely fashion.

### **7.5.4 Membership**

As per Section 2.1, except that the chair of Steering, the chairs of all Standing Committees, and the program director and program coordinator, are automatically members of the Constitution Committee.

As with all other standing committees, any member of the community not named above may participate. In order to ensure that members have adequate familiarity with the issues being discussed, it is expected that they make a one-year commitment to participation.

## **7.6 Standing Intellectual Development Committees**

### **7.6.1 Community-Based Research and Action (COBRA) Committee**

The COBRA committee meets as necessary to discuss issues relevant to those faculty and students working in the area of community-based research and action.

The chair, or delegate, makes a regular report to the Steering Committee as part of the section of the meeting devoted to reports from Committees.

### **7.6.2 Research-Creation Committee**

The Research-Creation committee meets as necessary to discuss issues relevant to those faculty and students working as cultural producers.

The chair, or delegate, makes a regular report to the Steering Committee as part of the section of the meeting devoted to reports from Committees.

### **7.6.3 The Research-Creation Committee Mandate:**

1. To foster a community hub for all CUST members who engage in research-creation by sharing resources, providing assistance with conceptual development, facilitating mutual critiques, and assisting in distribution and exposure of the creative work produced within research-creation projects.
2. To advocate for research-creation within the unit, the university and beyond. The committee addresses with the institution the production needs of artists for space, materials, etc. Advocacy may also involve education about research/creation as a form of inquiry and production of knowledge, and fundraising to support the work of those involved in research-creation.
3. To internally archive research-creation theses that come out of CUST so that the program has information and examples for other researchers (students, faculty and community members) to access in order to better understand research-creation in the context of CUST.
4. To help facilitate the Ethics Review Board process, both in terms of preparing students for the application process, as well as educating the Queen's University GREB about research-creation.
5. To review periodically and recommend to Steering changes regarding issues and policies concerning research-creation in liaison with the Curriculum and Community-based Research committees.

### **7.6.4 Awards Committee**

This committee meets annually to adjudicate awards for outstanding PhD dissertation and project-based research at the MA or PhD level. The Program Director chairs the committee, which includes two CUST faculty affiliates and a student in their second or third year of study.

#### **7.6.4.1 Awards Mandate**

The purpose of the awards is to celebrate outstanding dissertation and project-based research completed by MA and PhD candidates in the Cultural Studies Program in a given academic year.

### **7.6.5 Ad Hoc Committees**

The Steering Committee may, as needed, strike Ad Hoc Committees to take on a specific mandate for a limited period of time.

Ad Hoc committees are governed according to the policies and procedures that apply to all other committees.

## **8. Revisions & Self-Evaluation**

This is a living document. Everything that is here is subject to revision and change as the community itself changes. However, at the same time this document provides a set of principles that are core to the environment that we want to maintain, so changes should be made with an eye to the long term well-being of the program.

In the name of keeping our attention on matters of governance, the program is reviewed at least once every three years, as part of a self-evaluation process.

Changes to this document may only be made by the Steering Committee.