



Minutes

MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Tuesday October 30, 2012 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

Present: D. Woolf (Chair) **Senators:** H. Abdollah, M. Adams, A. Aulthouse, A. Bains, D. Bakhurst, E. Berkok, T. Bridges, B. Brouwer, M. Brunner, L. Cheng, L. Colgan, E. De Souza, D. Detomasi, A. Dimitrakopoulos, P. Fachinger, G. Farah, W. Flanagan, D. Garvie, A. Gill, A. Harrison, P. Hart, M. Hird, M. Jones, R. Karmali, T. Krupa, K. Kyser, I. LaFleche, C. MacDougall, A. MacLean, P. Martin, D. Maurice, N. McCormack, J. Medves, J. Morelli, C. Moyes, P. Murphy, P. Oosthuizen, B. Pardy, W. Prince, L. Purda, R. Reznick, D. Saunders, M. Scribner, K. Slobodin, A. Tierney, D. Tripp, T. Trothen, N. Tsui, C. Wang, M. Whitehead, K. Woodhouse, B. Yang, P. Young, S. Yousefi, L. Knox (Secretary), G. MacAllister (Associate)

Also present: P. Allin, T. Alm, J. Brady, A. Burfoot, C. Casher, K. Conway, Y. Cooper, R. Coupland, M. Daneen, C. Davis, C. Draeger, I. Duchaine, S. Dunn, N. Francis, M. Heeler, E. Hill, J. Hill, L. Long, B. King, G. MacAllister, S. Mason, V. Matak, J. McCarthy, D. McKeown, A. Mercier, D. Murakami Wood, A. Naples, D. Peterson, J. Pierce, S. Pinchin, W. Praamsma, D. Pugh, S. Rigden, N. Roane, C. Russell, T. Shearer, S. Shiels, G. Smith, H. Smith, P. Smolej, S. Verbeek, A. Vienneau, K. Wallace, P. Watkin, A. Zahid, I. Zuk

I OPENING SESSION

The Chair welcomed new senators R. Karmali and G. Farah to Senate. He announced that Janice Hill, Director of the Four Directions Aboriginal Student Centre, was now an Official Observer. He noted that G. MacAllister has assumed the role of Associate Secretary of the Senate as part of a reorganization of the University Secretariat. The Chair thanked C. Russell for her service to the Senate over the past three years and noted her continued involvement in Senate operations.

Members were reminded of the welcome reception for Senators immediately following the meeting at Summerhill.

The Chair requested a moment of silence to honour the memory of:

- Professor Emeritus David Robertson, Pathology & Molecular Medicine (October 15), who was a member of Senate from 1969 to 1972; and,
- Former Board of Trustees Chair Norman Rogers (October 8). He served on the Queen's University Board of Trustees for two decades, presiding as its Chair for five years and received an honorary LL.D. in 1987.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Berkok, that the agenda be adopted as circulated.

Carried 12-53

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of September 25, 2012 (Appendix A, page 1)

Moved by Senator Brouwer, seconded by Senator MacLean, that the minutes be adopted as circulated.

Carried 12-54

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

The Chair noted that a follow-up question from the September 25th meeting of Senate regarding advertisements on campus would be addressed during Question Period.

4. Principal's Report (Appendix B, page 17)

a) Schedule Highlights September – October 2012

The Principal drew attention to a report on his schedule highlights.

The provincial government situation and its impact on Queen's

The Principal reported that Premier McGuinty's surprise resignation two weeks ago paved the way for a leadership contest in late January 2013. The successful candidate will inherit a minority government, prorogued legislature and a political environment that is quite unpredictable. It is unknown whether the current Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Glen Murray, will run for the leadership. A change in minister may have an impact on the future of the Province's proposed mandate statements. Queen's Government Relations staff are monitoring developments and Senate will be updated as the situation evolves.

AUCC meetings

At the federal level, Queen's was a prominent player in the recent Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) meetings on Parliament Hill. The Principal had many opportunities to profile Queen's and to promote continued support of universities in meetings with two cabinet ministers, a deputy minister, and a major industry association, as well as in an interview with the *Globe and Mail*.

He noted that there appears to be some interest from the federal government for a national strategy for International Education. In a meeting with the Prime Minister's Chief of Staff, Nigel Wright, the Principal reinforced the pressing need for a national conversation on post-secondary education, given overlapping jurisdiction on student financial assistance, accreditation and research. The government continues to focus on innovation and productivity.

As Chair of the AUCC Standing Committee on International Relations, the Principal participated in two panels at the recent membership meeting. On the agenda were the recommendations of the Chakma Report on international education and the examination of ways in which universities could advocate and improve funding for international research collaborations.

Also on the federal front, Queen's has a new deputy minister champion assigned by the federal government to help strengthen linkages between the public service and the University. (All universities have a deputy minister champion.) The Principal has met with Malcolm Brown and he was very keen to help Queen's become better known and to help the federal government learn more about Queen's unique strengths and assets as they are relevant to federal policy priorities.

5. Provost's Report (Appendix C, page 18)

a) Report to Senate

The Provost referred to his written report provided with the agenda and welcomed questions. In addition, he noted that the search for a new Dean of Arts and Science is under way and that the search for the Dean of the Faculty of Law had moved to the committee level.

6. COU Academic Colleague's Report

a) Report to Senate

Senator Oosthuizen spoke to his written report, distributed at the meeting, and appended to the minutes. He informed Senators that the discussion at the meetings addressed many notable items such as the response to the MTCU discussion paper on "Strengthening Ontario's Centre of Creativity, Innovation and Knowledge, the Strategic Mandates submitted by post-secondary institutions, the audit of teaching assessments of University Faculty by the Auditor General of Ontario, and the Educators Accessibility Resource Kit developed by the COU in partnership with York, Guelph and the University of Toronto. He also informed members that the 16th Annual University Fair was a great success. He noted that the David C. Smith Award was presented to Chaviva M. Hošek, O.C. who is also a recipient of four honorary degrees and who is an Officer of the Order of Canada, The award is named for David C. Smith, former Queen's Principal, and the award is given annually at a dinner held in conjunction with the meeting of the COU.

II QUESTION PERIOD

The Chair reminded Members that the Rules of Procedure specify that Question Period is limited to 20 minutes. The Chair felt that adherence to this rule was important to ensure that Senate has sufficient time to devote to items which are on the agenda for action. Accordingly, matters not reached or fully addressed in this period would be held to the end of the Senate Meeting, if time permitted, or would be postponed to the subsequent meeting.

Question #1 from Senator Jones on commercial advertisements on campus (a follow-up from September 25, 2012)

Senator Jones requested that the Provost review the use of corporate advertising in spaces not controlled by the AMS.

Provost's response:

The Provost responded that a framework and guiding principles for the development of a new policy on advertising and commercial activity was created in 2002. This document recommends several restrictions. It suggests, for example, that advertising should not be in classrooms, laboratories or any other space that is devoted to academic purposes. The list of restrictions aligns with those found in the policies of other Canadian universities.

Despite putting this framework into place, Queen's does not currently have a policy on advertising, and nor does it have a policy on the development of University policies. To this end, the Vice-Principals and Provost will work with the University Secretariat to develop a University policy to guide the development of policies. After this policy is in place, a policy on advertising and commercial activity will be developed. The Provost will keep Senate apprised of developments and the Provost assured Senate that the process will ensure appropriately wide consultation for any new policy.

Question #2 from Senator Jones regarding the teaching of communication skills and discipline-specific training in writing

The Academic Plan approved by Senate almost a year ago recommends that Queen's "give communication skills priority, monitor them, foster their early enhancement, and be prepared to remediate them where necessary." It also affirms that "university students need to learn not just general communication skills but also the discursive / communicative practices appropriate to their specializations"--i.e., that they require "discipline-specific training" in writing. These recommendations were based on a broad consultative process that found strong support for

disciplinary training in writing. Could the Provost please inform Senate of any plans that the University has for implementing these recommendations?

Provost's response:

The Provost referred to his written report, which notes a plan to establish a task force on the student learning experience and the fundamental academic skills that the Academic Plan identifies as central to the Queen's student learning experience, including effective writing and communication. The goal is to develop a university-wide framework that will emphasize the assessment and evaluation of the development of these skills. The task force will also look at the role of support services such as the Centre for Teaching and Learning and the Learning Commons.

Question #3 from Senator Fachinger regarding the Queen's National Scholar Program

We would like to ask the Provost if he has been able to make a decision on the redesign of the QNS to make the process more efficient, e.g., by replacing the interdepartmental competition system with a managed allocation of QNS positions among departments/programs: rather than choosing from among proposals by many departments, the QNS committee would be responsible for considering which departments should have a chance to apply for a QNS in a given year. Also, will the hiring of an Aboriginal QNS in Indigenous Studies be a top priority as recommended in the Academic Plan?

Provost's response:

The Provost drew attention to his written report. He noted that the QNS program had been redesigned due to comments received about the structure of the previous program and will now involve two stages. The goal is to require less work in the initial stage, and then to reduce the number of proposals to four (twice the number of QNS positions available) before the second stage begins. He encouraged Senators to consult his report for more details or email provost@queensu.ca if they had questions.

Specifically in reference to whether a QNS in Indigenous Studies would be a top priority in hiring a faculty member, the Provost informed members that there will be no particular field or fields specified in advance, nor areas of the University which would be disqualified from submitting a proposal.

Senator Fachinger stated that the QNS program was devised to recruit faculty from designated underrepresented groups and asked how the new process met those objectives. The Provost noted that there is an agreement with QUFA that addresses the QNS program and the process is in keeping with that agreement. As per Queen's practice, attention will be paid to equity considerations in the hiring of any faculty member.

In follow-up, further to the recommendation of the Academic Plan, Senator Fachinger asked whether there has been progress in establishing an endowed Chair position in Aboriginal Studies.

The Chair ruled that this question sufficiently deviated from the line of inquiry as to constitute a new question and requested that Senator Fachinger submit this question for inclusion on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

Question #4 from Senator Jones regarding the CAUT Report

[The CAUT Ad Hoc Investigatory Committee Report on the situation and treatment of Dr. Michael Mason in the Department of History at Queen's University](#), released September 20, 2012, concludes "that administrative employees and officers of Queen's University abused their power and acted in disregard of the wellbeing of one of their teaching employees," and says also "that Professor Mason was denied basic rights, and that academic freedom, both as commonly understood and as defined in

the collective agreement between QUFA and Queen's University, was seriously violated" (p. 17). It is well understood that Queen's Administration denies CAUT's jurisdiction in this matter. Yet this jurisdictional distinction does nothing in itself to disprove or discredit the conclusions of the Report, which was published by a highly credible authority, which has been widely and respectfully reported in the media ([QUFA Forum](#) provides many of the links), and which has been [endorsed by QUFA](#) itself. In view of the significant damage that the Report's conclusions may cause to the university's academic reputation, would the Provost please explain why the Administration has never yet responded to the charges levelled against it? If CAUT's charges are wrong, why not publicly refute them; if they are right, why not simply apologize and show that we can admit and learn from mistakes?

The Provost read the following prepared statement:

"Queen's has consistently taken the position that the CAUT has no jurisdiction in the matter it was asked to investigate. Accordingly, and appropriately, Queen's did not participate in the CAUT investigation. Senator Jones asks why, notwithstanding our unwillingness to participate, we would not pass comment on the report.

The investigation report indicates that matters giving rise to the investigation were referred to the CAUT by QUFA. We do not understand why QUFA elected to refer the matter to the CAUT. Academic freedom is enshrined in the Queen's-QUFA collective agreement. If it is QUFA's view that at any time a faculty member's rights to academic freedom have been violated, QUFA has access to the grievance procedures in the collective agreement to grieve the University's actions and such a grievance could, if necessary, be adjudicated by an independent third party. This is the process agreed to by QUFA and Queen's in the collective agreement.

I further note that when this particular matter came to light, the University indicated to QUFA that it wished to conduct an investigation, using a process set out in the collective agreement agreed between QUFA and Queen's. QUFA strongly discouraged the University from exercising the provisions of the collective agreement that provide the process for that investigation.

I am not at liberty to say more about the particulars of this matter, both because I would be addressing personnel matters, and also because, in accordance with the express wishes of QUFA, the matter has not been formally investigated by the University. It is sufficient to say that the University does not agree with the conclusions of the CAUT report. Not only are the conclusions based on incomplete information, they are also incorrect. We also disagree with the conclusions on principle, because CAUT has appointed itself both investigator and arbiter. This, as a process, is an inherently conflicted one, and one that we therefore cannot accept. By contrast, the collective agreement gives both parties fair and impartial investigation and review options.

Finally, and as I have said before, and shall say again, I am always open to discussions with QUFA regarding this or other matters of concerns to faculty members."

In response, Senator Jones reiterated that he still has concerns from a reputational perspective that Queen's will not respond directly to the matters expressed by CAUT or in the *Globe and Mail*.

The Provost responded, stating that administration is reviewing its options with respect to the *Globe and Mail* opinion piece and should there be a response it would reflect the views already expressed as it would need to be considered carefully as this is a personnel matter.

Question #5 from Senator Slobodin regarding plans for new residence buildings

At the September session of the Board of Trustees, a motion was passed to approve the purchasing of plans for new residence buildings. Within the year it is presumed that the Board of Trustees will be asked to vote to approve the construction of these new residence buildings.

a) Given that there has been no comprehensive and long-term enrolment plan created by Senate,

and that enrolment planning is one of the primary functions of Senate, could the Provost please explain to Senate why discussions surrounding residence building construction are being brought up to the Board of Trustees before they have come to Senate?

- b) Presumably, the Provost's office has some plan for the new residence buildings. Can the Provost elaborate on what stage his internal office is in enrolment planning and why the information has not yet been shared with Senate?

Provost's response:

The Provost advised that his written report to Senate addressed some of the issues raised in Senator Slobodin's question. In particular, the Provost referred to the creation of a Strategic Enrolment Management Group, which conforms to a recommendation from the University's Enrolment Planning Task Force and which met during the 2010-2011 academic year. The enrolment plan approved by Senate in February 2011 (for one year, 2011/2012 academic year) stated that the Task Force was continuing to discuss options to address Queen's anticipated share of funded growth in the system (approximately 2,400 undergraduates over five years). This position was consistent with growth projections submitted by Queen's to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities in May, 2010.

These projections were the basis on which planning for new residence spaces began, culminating in a siting and massing study for two residences. The University recently received approval from the Board of Trustees for the expenditure of \$400,000 to pay for more detailed planning of these two residences. Residences are an ancillary operation of the university and funds for this expenditure will come from the Residence budget. Such decisions are within the Board's mandate.

The University cannot grow without new residences but constructing new residences does not mean that the University must grow as there is already existing demand for additional residence spaces.

The decision on whether Queen's will grow depends on Senate's approval of an enrolment plan. Growth also depends on the availability of provincial government funding.

In response to a follow-up question, the Provost noted that there is currently no long-term enrolment plan, but that one is anticipated to come to Senate in the spring of 2013.

Question #6 from Senator Morelli regarding Senior Administration's consultation with Senate

The 'Central Function' of Senate provides that Senate "... is concerned with all matters that affect the general welfare of the University and its constituents. Senate shall serve as a forum for discussion and exchange of ideas among the members of the University community."

In the past year alone we have seen many decisions made by Senior Administration without any consultation with Senate, let alone with the broader University community, and these decisions (such as the suspension of admissions to the BFA program in November 2011, or the more recent announcement that the administration plans to add residence capacity for 550 new beds, which could translate into an increased enrolment of 2200 students) have serious impacts on the general welfare of the University and its constituents.

Furthermore, the 'Purpose and Functions of Senate' document clearly states that Senate **will** "participate in strategic planning for the University, including but not limited to the budgetary process and campus planning and development."

In order for Senate to fulfil its obligations to the University, we need to reclaim and reaffirm these functions. Senate must commit to discussing these types of major issues, and we must demand that our Senior Administrators bring all such major issues before Senate prior to committing the University to a particular course of action.

Will the Principal and Provost publicly commit Senior Administration to conduct itself in a consultative manner whereby major decisions, such as those noted above, are approved or at least discussed in Senate before the University is committed to particular courses of action?

Principal's response:

The Principal stated that the Senior Administration is fully committed to consultation with Senate. Two recent examples, the Academic Plan and the Strategic Research Plan, were the focus of extensive Senate consultation over a two-year period. In addition, regular consultation takes place via Senate and other University committees. Queen's Administration will continue actively to seek Senate's input on the full range of priority issues and initiatives affecting the University community. With regard to the two specific issues raised in the question regarding the BFA program and residence capacity:

- 1) The Principal has asked for a legal opinion on decanal authority regarding financial decisions relating to programs. He has been informed by Justice Iacobucci's office that the opinion is expected to be delivered to Queen's during the week of November 4th. Furthermore, senators will be aware that the circumstances leading to the suspension of admissions to the BFA program prompted a call for the Senate Committee on Academic Development to report on the need for a process to deal with similar scenarios in the future. SCAD will make its report to Senate on this matter once it has had the opportunity to consider Mr. Justice Iacobucci's report.
- 2) With regard to residence capacity, the demand for spaces exceeds availability, so options for creating more space are being explored. Enrolment is different a different function than planning residence space and enrolment will continue to be dealt with at Senate.

Question #7 from Senator Berkok regarding short-term mental health initiatives.

We are all well aware of the increased pressure on mental health services on campus. There's been a lot of positive conversation about how to restructure our system in the future to best support students; however, as we come up to the second anniversary of the beginning of this conversation, what steps are being taken this year to bolster mental health resources until long-term solutions are in place?

Principal's response:

The Chair informed Senate that many long-term and short-term actions have been implemented over the last few years to support student mental health. They align with recommendations made by the Principal's Commission on Mental Health in its discussion paper released in June. These include:

- The establishment of an Advisory Committee on Academic Accommodations – its first meeting is scheduled for this term. This committee will assist faculty to determine how to accommodate student needs and reduce related uncertainty and stress.
- The hiring of an additional part-time advisor in the Health Counselling and Disability Services, which has sped up the student accommodation process.
- The creation and distribution of a "Green Folder" education tool to all faculty, staff and TAs to help them identify and respond to students in distress.
- The launch of the Summer Orientation to Academics and Resources in July 2012 attended by more than 800 incoming first-year students and their families. They met and heard from current students, professors, academic advisors and residence staff.
- The expansion of Parent Information Sessions during move-in day that emphasized health and

wellness and support services available.

- The renovation of three unused gyms in the Physical Education Centre to increase recreational opportunities for students starting next year and ease exam scheduling as of December.
- The introduction of shorter wait times for counselling thanks to a new triage model implemented last fall. This has produced a 20% increase in the number of student contacts and the provision of more counselling hours over the summer. Students in distress are seen within a day or two; many students in immediate crisis are seen the same day.
- Better access to psychiatric services starting last fall with the hiring of an additional part-time psychiatrist.

The commission's final report is expected later this fall, at which time an implementation plan will be put in place.

Senator Berkok thanked those involved for all of the work that has gone into this initiative and in follow-up, asked whether this has resulted in increased demand for the services of Health Counselling and Disability Services. The Principal asked Senator Berkok to submit the question for response at the next Senate meeting to allow the Vice-Provost and Dean of Student Affairs adequate time to review available information.

III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. **Nominating** (Appendix E, page 27)
 - a) Election to Committees

Moved by Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator Colgan, that the individual named in the report in Appendix E, page 27, be elected to the Nominating Committee, effective immediately.

Carried 12-55

2. **Academic Procedures** (Appendix F, page 28)
 - a) Proposal to amend the Policy on Transcript Terminology for Students withdrawing from Queen's University

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Woodhouse that the changes to the Policy on Transcript Terminology for Students withdrawing from Queen's University as stated in Appendix F, page 28 be approved and updated on the Senate website for information.

Carried 12-56

SCAP Chair, T. Shearer, explained that the amendment would add language to the waiver of the requirement to withdraw on a student's transcript to note that it was waived upon appeal. If a student successfully appealed to drop a course after the final drop date had passed, then the notation stating the student was required to withdraw would be removed from the transcript and the student could immediately resume their studies.

However, if a student has the requirement to withdraw waived upon appeal and failing marks remain on the transcript, the marks could indicate that the student has not met the academic standards for the program. The transcript notation "requirement to withdraw waived upon appeal" would signify to those reviewing the transcript that a determination of extenuating circumstances had been made sufficient to justify waiving the requirement to withdraw regardless of the evidence of failures on the transcript.

Senator Jones raised two concerns with the policy revisions. First, that it is not sufficient to add “waived on appeal” to the transcript. If the requirement to withdraw is waived, it should be completely expunged from the transcript. Secondly, unlike marks, which are noted on the transcript permanently, breaches of academic integrity are not permanently reflected on the transcript. After the notation is expunged through lapse of time, there is no way for anyone viewing the transcript to know of this serious infraction. If the concern is to preserve the history and integrity of the academic record, expunging statements regarding breaches of academic integrity after a specific period of time would be contrary to that principle. In his opinion, a breach of academic integrity is a serious matter that should be reflected on the permanent record, more so than a requirement to withdraw that has been waived upon appeal.

It was moved by Senator Jones, seconded by Senator Young that the matter be referred back to SCAD for further consideration. The motion was defeated.

In response to a question whether a student may request to remove the waiver statement upon appeal, Professor Shearer noted that with one exception in 2011 at USAB, normally appeal bodies do not ask to remove the notation regarding the requirement to withdraw from the transcript.

3. Advisory Research Committee (Appendix G, page 32)

- a) Request for formal centre status for the Surveillance Studies Centre

Moved by Senator Adams, seconded by Senator Woodhouse, that Senate approve formal centre status of the Surveillance Studies Centre for a period of five years, effective October 1, 2012, subject to ratification by the Board of Trustees.

Carried 12-57

4. Operations Review Committee (Appendix H, page 57)

- a) Report to Senate

SORC Chair Senator L. Colgan drew members’ attention report to Senate, attached to the agenda, on the work of the Committee. There were no questions. The Chair thanked Senator Colgan and the committee for their work.

5. Academic Planning Task Force (Appendix I, page 58)

- a) Report to Senate

The Chair drew members’ attention to the Academic Planning Task Force report included with the agenda. As there were no questions, the Chair thanked Senator Moyes and the members of the Task Force for the work being conducted on behalf of Senate.

6. Queen’s University Planning Committee

- a) Oral report to Senate by Senator Bakhurst

Senator Bakhurst, a member of the QUPC, noted that the QUPC had met on September 5. The Committee discussed the University’s Budget Strategy and reviewed the methods used to balance the 2012-13 budget (which included using internal reserves to provide funding for one-time/limited term expenditures). The Provost gave a report on the development of the new budget model; and the committee reviewed the cycle for budget and staffing submissions for 2013-14. The committee also discussed the Queen’s Proposed Mandate Statement. It heard background on the Ministry’s request to Ontario universities to provide proposed mandate statements. Input was sought from the QUPC members, who represent both Senate and the Board, on the three priority objectives for Queen’s that would be included in the statement. The Provost also announced his intention to draft, at the request of the Board of Trustees, a Strategic Framework that will use as its foundation the Academic Plan, Strategic

Research Plan and the final Strategic Mandate Agreement resulting from the Proposed Mandate Statement. The November 5th Queen's University Planning Committee meeting will include further discussion of the development of the Strategic Framework and a report on the progress of the Campus Master Plan.

7. Library Committee (Appendix J, page 60)

a) Annual Report 2011-2012

The Chair drew members' attention to the Library Committee report included with the agenda and informed members that Senator M. Whitehead, the University Librarian, was in attendance to answer questions. As there were no questions, the Chair thanked Senator Whitehead and the members of the Library Committee for the work being conducted on behalf of Senate.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES

None Received.

V MOTIONS (Appendix K, page 64)

1. Queen's for-credit courses to pass Curriculum Committee Review submitted by Senator Jones

The Chair reminded members that in order to ensure that procedures are followed and all Senators are heard, no member may speak twice to a motion except to explain a material part of his or her speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood.

Moved by Senator Jones, seconded by Senator Yousefi that Senate task SCAD with reviewing academic approval procedures to ensure that all courses, activities, and programs for which Queen's academic credits are awarded, including those that are on campus, wholly or partly off-campus, wholly or partly online, offered as blended versions of existing courses, offered through Queen's-Blyth or the BISC, developed and/or taught under the auspices of more than one Faculty, and/or developed in one Faculty for enrolment by students in another Faculty or Faculties, undergo approval by the Curriculum Committee of each Faculty that plays any role in creating, staffing, offering, granting credit for, and/or administering them; and that they be approved by the appropriate unit(s) within each of the departmentalized Faculties.

The motion was defeated on a recorded vote: 20 in favour, 25 against, 1 abstention.

The Chair recognized Associate Dean John Pierce who informed Senate that it is his role to ensure that the integrity of courses offered by Queen's by the Faculty of Arts and Science have met the standards of the Faculty and have met the requirements of the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Board, which ultimately approves all courses. Dr. Pierce noted two concerns with the motion before Senate. First, that the motion was too general in nature as it seemed to imply that courses must go through the approval process for any individual method of employing the course and that this would be limiting to instructors who continually seek new mechanisms to offer courses in imaginative and creative ways. Second, curriculum changes go through a very rigorous process at the department and faculty level and currently the Faculty of Arts and Science sees hundreds of submissions annually. Approval of this motion would significantly hamper the Faculty's ability to get course approvals through the appropriate channels in a reasonable timeframe. The increase in the number of courses needing to go through approval would significantly decrease the ability to provide new offerings in a timely manner.

Senator Morelli indicated that he interpreted the motion differently and that the motion does not limit academic freedom and that it is not charging SCAD to do anything except to review policy and procedures regarding curriculum approval. He noted that, in his opinion, the motion does not interfere with faculty innovation in course preparation or delivery to any greater degree than the current process of curriculum approval.

Senators Woodhouse, MacLean and Flanagan spoke against the motion stating that the motion effectively combines curriculum with delivery modes and that curriculum approval is based on the quality of the material provided not with how or where the material is delivered to students. The Faculties of Law, Applied Science and Arts and Science have rigorous approval mechanisms and, in their opinions, those processes are followed. They also agreed that this motion, as stated, would have a detrimental effect on academic freedom.

A separate concern noted by Senator Harrison was that the motion presumes a specific outcome by SCAD. By placing the word “ensure” in the motion, it limits SCAD’s ability to do its work with without having a pre-defined outcome.

Senator Yousefi spoke in favour of the motion noting that having had experience as both an Undergraduate Chair and Curriculum Chair in Applied Science he felt that this would ensure that the content of the course would match the title and the short description provided in the calendar.

Senator Adams noted that she also was in favour of the motion as any courses she has offered have been justified to her colleagues in the department through their curriculum review process and it is the curriculum committee that approved them. She has never felt this to be an infringement on her academic freedom.

Senator Moyes was not in favour of the motion as he felt it had overlap with the tasks currently before the Senate Academic Planning Task Force and that it was preferable to allow the APTF to complete its work in terms of online learning before any decisions were made about quality assurance, at least at it relates to online delivery.

Upon invitation from the Chair to speak to the motion, Senator Jones noted that the spirit of this motion is simply to ensure that everything which Queen’s offers for academic credit is academically vetted. It arises from emerging practices which have left some apparent loopholes. Senator Jones read a statement of support for this motion from Professor Annette Burfoot which is attached as Appendix B to the minutes.

In response to the objections raised by his colleagues, Senator Jones replied as follows:

Queen’s already uses Curriculum Committees (CCs) to vet most courses academically, and that is not deemed to infringe instructors' academic freedom. The same would hold for the new matters that the motion asks are submitted to the CCs. CCs approve the course in general, not the specific iteration of the course. Senator Jones noted that ENGL 292 was approved as a course by the CC and it was his duty as a paid instructor is to deliver ENGL 292 so that it is recognizably the course approved by the CC. This does not infringe on his right to teach it as he chooses. The same would hold for all new matters referred to the CCs.

In response to concerns around the technical language of the motion regarding the fact that it is not the curriculum committees themselves which approve courses, but the Faculty Boards, Senator Jones stated that he would be agreeable to a friendly amendment to revise “approval” (3 lines up in the motion) to “vetting.”

With respect to concerns regarding overlap with the work of the Academic Planning Task Force, Senator Jones stated that the APTF has been charged with academic planning around “virtualization and online learning,” not specifically with approval processes.

With respect to concerns raised that the curriculum committees may not be the proper venue for all review, Senator Jones stated that he did not agree with this, but felt that the motion refers the matter to SCAD, and if SCAD were to suggest a different venue for proper academic vetting, it could come back to Senate with that explanation and an alternative proposal.

At this point the Chair called for a vote. It was requested by Senator Morelli that the vote be recorded.

2. Revision of Rules of Procedure submitted by Senator Berkok

Principal Woolf asked Senator Oosthuizen to assume the Chair as he would like to speak to the motion before Senate. Senator Oosthuizen assumed the Chair.

It was moved by Senator Berkok and seconded by Senator Wang that the Rules of Procedure of Senate be revised to include the following:

- 1. That the Principal and Provost reports be included, in writing, along with the release of the Senate agenda.**
- 2. That the Principal and Provost use their oral reports at Senate to highlight only key elements of their written reports, and update Senate on any crucial proceedings that occurred between the release of the agenda and the Senate meeting. Oral updates are to be limited to ten minutes each.**
- 3. That any other reports, presentations, or information items be included along with the release of the agenda if they are available by the agenda submission deadline.**
- 4. That Section VII of the rules of procedure be amended to move Question Period below Motions in the agenda.**

Senators Jones and Morelli requested that item 4 be separated from items 1, 2 and 3 and voted on separately. This request was granted as item 4 was not integral to items 1, 2 and 3.

Senator Berkok was invited to speak to the motion. He noted that there are many important issues for Senate to address and that by strengthening the rules of procedure and modifying the order of the agenda it would provide a better platform for discussion of substantive items

Principal Woolf noted that while he was sympathetic with the spirit of the motion and that he was confident that everyone shares an interest in the matters of Senate being dealt with in a thorough, yet expeditious manner, he had two concerns with the motion. Firstly, he was concerned with procedure and that Senate has a governance structure that has committees appointed to study procedures and that everything in the motion is procedural, yet the Senate Operations Review Committee has not been asked to investigate and report on their recommendations regarding the motion. Matters such as these are not generally decided in Committee of the Whole without first being studied at the committee level. Secondly, the Provost and the Principal, although happy to take guidance from Senate, were concerned with the prescriptive nature of the motion, as it limits the Principal's and Provost's ability to present on substantive matters to no longer than 10 minutes. Principal Woolf agreed that it was healthy for Senate to review its procedures regularly to ensure efficiency. Senator Morelli asked Principal Woolf if he was suggesting that the motion be referred to the Senate Operations Review Committee for review. Principal Woolf felt that this was the appropriate mechanism to address the substantive issues raised in the motion.

It was moved by Principal Woolf and seconded by Senator Elliott that the entire motion, items 1 through 4 inclusive, be referred to the Senate Operations Review Committee for consideration.

Carried 12-58

Principal Woolf resumed the Chair.

VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE

1. Board of Trustees Meeting – September 25, 2012 (Appendix L, page 66)

The Chair welcomed staff Trustee Dean McKeown to Senate to speak to the Board of Trustees report to Senate. The Chair noted that this is in keeping with the desire expressed at the joint Board/Senate Retreat for more opportunities for communication between the Board and Senate.

Trustee McKeown noted that he appreciated the opportunity to continue the momentum started at the joint Board/Senate Retreat in September and to help Senate put a face to Trustees. He informed Senate that he takes his role as a Trustee very seriously and that it is important that a link be maintained between the Board of Trustees and Senate. He welcomed comments on the report. Senator Morelli expressed his appreciation for the report and welcomed the Board's representative to Senate stating that he hoped that this mechanism continues in the future.

2. Research Report (Appendix M, page 68)

The Chair drew members' attention to the Research Report included with the agenda and informed members that S. Verbeek of the Vice-Principal Research Office was in attendance to answer questions. Seeing none, the Chair thanked Ms. Verbeek for the report and for attending Senate.

The Chair took the opportunity to acknowledge the work of Associate Vice-Provost (Research) Susan Marlin, who is leaving Queen's, and to thank her for her many contributions to Senate and to Queen's. In particular, Ms Marlin served as the Principal's Delegate since 2006 on the Senate Information Technology Committee.

3. Safe Disclosure Reporting and Investigation – Annual Report 2011-2012 (Appendix N, page 71)

The Chair drew members' attention to the Safe Disclosure Reporting and Investigation Annual Report included with the agenda and informed members that the Coordinator of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms, H. Smith was in attendance to answer questions. As there were no questions, the Chair thanked Mr Smith for his attendance at Senate.

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES (Appendix N, page 54)

1. Changes to Senate Procedure [Referred to the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC)]

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

Senator Berkok requested to ask an additional question as a follow up to an earlier question on mental health initiatives. As the hour was late, Senator Berkok was asked to submit his question to be addressed at the next Senate meeting.

IX CLOSED SESSION

None.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Lon Knox
University Secretary

**Council of Ontario Universities
294th Council Meeting****Held in Toronto on Thursday, October 11, 2012****ACADEMIC COLLEAGUE'S REPORT TO SENATE**

Format of Meeting: As is usual, the overall meeting involved Executive Heads Meetings, two Academic Colleagues Meetings, and the Council Meeting. However, while previous Council meetings had been held over two days, in order to reduce the required time commitment, this meeting was held over one day with the Academic Colleagues and Executive Heads meetings being held in the morning and afternoon and the Council meeting being held as a working-lunch. In addition, the 2012 David C. Smith Award Dinner was held in the evening. The following are some of the main topics that were discussed at Council meeting and at the Colleagues meetings.

Response to MTCU discussion paper on Strengthening Ontario's Centre of Creativity, Innovation and Knowledge: This was a topic that dominated the much of the discussion at the meeting. Responses to the MTCU paper had been prepared by a number of post-secondary institutions and other stakeholders in the post-secondary sector. Bonnie Patterson, the COU President, reviewed and discussed the responses prepared by COU, OPSEU, CUPE, OCUFA, OUSA, CFS-O, and Colleges Ontario. It is expected that the ministry may prepare a second paper based on the results of their consultations and on the responses received to the first report. The Strategic Mandate responses could also have an influence on this second report. Of course, the future of this matter is somewhat uncertain in view of the premier's resignation.

Strategic Mandate Agreements: The Strategic Mandate Agreement proposals prepared by Ontario's post-secondary institutions are now available on-line. The Minister has directed the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) to establish a peer review panel and to "identify a shortlist of colleges and universities whose submissions demonstrate the greatest ability to serve as lead institutions – models of advanced education in the 21st century." Staff of MTCU have indicated that the submission of the proposals will be the beginning of a process. It is anticipated that the ministry will engage institutions in discussions of the proposals, leading to completion of mandate agreements. There is no clear indication of the time by which the ministry expects that these agreements will be concluded. MTCU has indicated that agreements are intended to be public documents.

Audit of Teaching Assessments of University Faculty by Auditor General of Ontario: The Office of the Auditor General of Ontario (OAGO) is conducting a "value-for-money" audit of how faculty members' teaching is evaluated at Ontario universities. The focus of the audit is to assess whether universities have established appropriate procedures for the evaluation of faculty teaching and whether those procedures are being followed. Three universities were selected to be visited by OAGO staff to review teaching evaluation policies and procedures and to test compliance, these being the University of Ontario Institute for Technology, the University of Toronto and Brock University. The Auditor General's findings are expected to be published in the December 2012 Auditor General's report.

Educators Accessibility Resource Kit : In partnership with the University of Guelph, the University of Toronto, and York University, COU has developed a new Educators Accessibility Resource, a toolkit of resources intended to assist educators in creating an accessible learning environments for students and to promote accessibility awareness. The project has developed tools to assist universities in complying with Section 16 of the Integrated Accessibility Standards: Training for Educators, as part of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). The Educators Accessibility Resource Kit will also aid in the instruction of students with invisible disabilities, such as mental illness, by increasing mental health awareness and supporting early identification, prevention and support of mental health related invisible disabilities. The following general tools are available: Introduction to Accessible Education, Developing Courses, Writing a Course Syllabus, Creating Accessible Lectures, Using PowerPoint, Using Word Documents and/or PDFs, Evaluating Students and Giving Feedback.

16th Annual Ontario Universities Fair (OUF): The fair, which was, as usual, held at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre, again appears to have been very successful and was attended by more than 119,000 students and parents. It is the largest educational fair in Canada and one of the largest in North America.

Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer (ONCAT): The Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer (ONCAT) has now been incorporated and a board has been elected. The university members of the board are: Dominic Giroux (Laurentian) as the university sector co-chair of the board, Peter Ricketts (Carleton) and Rhonda Lenton (York). The college members are: Don Lovisa (Durham College) as the college sector co-chair, Cindy Hazell (Seneca College), and Linda Love (Georgian College). The board also includes student and external members. ONCAT is intended to advance implementation of a province-wide credit transfer system.

Online Institute: The provincial government has announced that an online institute for the postsecondary sector will be established. Executive Heads have directed the COU Secretariat to consult on a mandate and business case for the establishment of an entity owned and operated by a consortium of Ontario universities. On August 28, 2012, COU hosted a one-day intensive planning session which sought to develop a mandate and early deliverables for an online entity. COU is reviewing the input provided and developing a business plan for consideration. The provincial government has not confirmed its directions or funding for the online institute. COU continues to seek clarification of the government's objectives and expectations.

David Smith Dinner: Chaviva M. Hošek, O.C., was honoured with the David C. Smith award at the dinner held as an adjunct to the COU meeting. She is CIFAR President Emeritus, having retired from CIFAR in June 2012 after more than 11 years as its President and CEO. Prior to this role, she was from 1993 to 2000 Director of Policy and Research in the Prime Minister's Office for Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. She served a term as Minister of Housing in Ontario, spent 13 years with the Department of English Literature at the University of Toronto, held senior governance positions at the University of Toronto and the University of British Columbia, and has served on the boards of a number of charitable, academic and commercial institutions. She has received four honorary degrees and is an Officer of the Order of Canada. The David C. Smith Award for Significant Contribution to Scholarship and Policy on Higher Education in Canada is presented annually to an individual who has significantly advanced higher education and research. It is named for the late Queen's Principal David C. Smith,

Patrick H. Oosthuizen
Academic Colleague
Queen's University

October 24, 2012

Appendix B

V. Motions 1)

Statement in Support of the Motion presented by Mark Jones from Annette Burfoot, Professor of Sociology:

When I began work at Queens in 1989, serving in Senate was a privilege to be earned and attendance at Faculty Board was assigned to all members of my department on a rotation basis. We were enough full time faculty that we each attended only twice a year. Working on the Faculty Curriculum Committee was an onerous job (all new courses and substantial course changes went through this committee) and it took time as its members carefully deliberated over each case.

And now most faculty would be only too happy to give up all three levels of careful academic assessment given heavy teaching and supervisory loads (the number of FTE faculty in my department is less than half of what it was when I started at Queens with no sign of new positions and more retirements looming) alongside incredible expectations to lead in profitable research.

But if what we do here at this university is of any value, we shouldn't accept this trend to forgo a key part of academic accreditation. I firmly believe that Queen's greatest asset is its reputation as providing an excellent, primarily undergraduate education. Yes, we have very good graduate programs and yes, we have some leading researchers and some ground-breaking projects. But all of this is based on this place as providing a solid post-secondary education. As we bend and twist curriculum, courses and programs to meet stated financial exigencies and provincial calls for increasing graduate enrolments, that base has become seriously eroded. I am against neither technological innovation in the classroom (I have used it from acetate overheads and video clips to iclickers, Moodle and video streaming) nor satellite education (I taught in both Belleville and Brockville throughout long winters on the 401 several times). But then, the administrative cart did not pull the pedagogical horse.

I heartily support this motion which is simply confirming that all Queen's credited courses follow a Senate-driven, faculty and unit-involved process of accreditation.