



Minutes

MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Tuesday, September 27, 2011 in Mackintosh-Corry Hall, Room B201 at 3:30 p.m.

Present: D. Woolf (Chair) **Senators:** Adams, Bassar, Bevan, Blennerhassett, Brouwer, Burford-Grinnell, Campbell, Cheng, Colgan, Culham, Dickey Young, Dimitrakopoulos, Dimitrov, Elliott, El-Rahimy, Fachinger, Flanagan, Foo, Garvie, Harrison, Hart, Hird, Johnson, Kyser, LaFleche, Liss, Lobb, MacLean, Maurice, McIntire, Medves, D. Moore, Morelli, Murray, Newcomb, Oleschuk, Parker, Reid, Remenda, Reznick, Shearer, Summers, Tierney, Tripp, Walters, Wang, Whitehead, Woodhouse, Young, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

Also Present: S. Cole, C. Davis, M. Dineen, J. Dixon, H. Everson, N. Francis, B. Grant, E. Hanson, J. Holmes, A. Jansman, M. Jones, R. Laing, C. Yan Lam, G. Lessard, L. Long, K. O'Brien, C. Owsik, I. Reeve, S. Rigden, K. Slobodin, H. Smith, C. Sumbler, S. Tanner, P. Taylor, K. Wallace, P. Watkin, J. Whittaker

I OPENING SESSION

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed senators to the first Senate meeting of the academic year.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by Senator Lafleche, seconded by Senator Foo, that the agenda be adopted as circulated.
Carried 11-53

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 25 May 2011 (Appendix A, page 1)

Moved by Senator Culham, seconded by Senator MacLean, that the minutes of May 25, 2011 be adopted.
Carried 11-54

3. Business Arising from the Minutes (Appendix B, page 12)

- a) Queen's University Quality Assurance Processes
<http://www.queensu.ca/provost/responsibilities/qualityassurance/QUQAPsFinalApr28-11.pdf>

Senator Harrison reviewed the approval process for the QUQAPs document.

Moved by Senator Harrison, seconded by Senator Woodhouse, that Senate approve receipt of the QUQAPs as presented.

Carried 11-55

Moved by Senator Harrison, seconded by Senator Woodhouse, that Senate rescind the following, effective September 27, 2011:

- Policies and Procedures for Establishing New Undergraduate Programs
- Approval Process for New Graduate Programs
- Internal Academic Review.

Carried 11-56

4. Principal's Report

Provincial election

The Chair congratulated the AMS and SGPS on their campaigns to get students to vote in the October 6 provincial election. He noted that provincial government is the University's main funding source and that post-secondary education funding had been central to the campaign. He did, however, note that the outlook for post-secondary funding was not promising, given the focus on healthcare. He expects that the Academic Plan will provide a framework for University priorities. The themes in the plan are consistent with keeping Queen's as a balanced academy and innovation in teaching and learning. The University community must continue to be creative in finding new resources and pull together to chart its course.

5. Provost's Report

a) Report to Senate (Appendix B, page 12)

The Provost referred to a recent trip to a Queen's satellite campus, the Bader International Study Centre in the UK. He noted that he looks forward to meeting as many faculty, staff and students as possible.

Budget

He highlighted Queen's budget concerns and the requirement by the Board of Trustees to balance the budget by 2012-13. Slightly more than \$9 million is required to close the revenue gap.

Uncertainty exists on several fronts. Long-term low interest rates have adversely affected pension plan solvency. Financial markets are affecting the pooled investment fund. The Provost has made recent presentations about the budget to the Finance Committee of the Board and also to the Board. All unit budgets will remain unchanged from 2011-12. The task ahead is to change the budget model to so it ensures a sustainable budget and encourages activities guided by the central pillars of the Academic Plan. The new budget model is in its early stages and will go through a consultative process involving members of the University community.

6. Other Reports requested by Senate

a) Senate Committee agenda topics (Appendix D, page 17)

There were no questions or comments.

b) Preliminary report on Admissions and Enrolment – Oral report by Jo-Anne Brady, University Registrar

J.-A Brady reported that undergraduate programs are close to enrolment projections, although PhD enrolment appears to be down slightly. Graduate program registrations will continue through October. The Registrar will deliver a final enrolment report at the November Senate meeting.

In response to a question regarding a possible correlation between PhD enrolment and the granting councils' funding models, the Registrar replied that the removal of the floor and ceiling on stipends should be a positive move.

II QUESTION PERIOD

Senator McIntire asked why the University was responding to the request from the Board of Trustees to eliminate the budget deficit by 2013. She noted that other institutions around the world are facing financial pressures and asked why the University could not continue to carry a deficit in a global economic crisis, when not carrying a deficit would severely damage the educational experience at Queen's. The Provost, an Economics professor, replied that the University has operated with a deficit budget for four years and it is not a sustainable practice. Many of the problems besetting the world's financial markets is that countries

continue to run deficits and live beyond their means. The University is at the mercy of the government, which determines funding related to student enrolment and controls tuition fee increases.¹

In response to a question from Senator Morelli about capital budgets being funded out of the operating budget, the Chair noted that a business planning process for all new construction projects had been used for the last 1.5 years. All funding has to be in place or identified before construction can begin. The University is servicing the debt on previous construction projects from the operating budget. These decisions were made before any members of the current administration were at the University.

The Chair invited any further questions be submitted in writing to the next Senate meeting to allow time for sufficient discussion of the Academic Plan later in the meeting.

III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Nominating (Appendix E, page 20)

a) Elections

Senator Blennerhassett clarified that the names of Alternate Chairs of the University Student Appeal Board are provided for the information of Senate and not for approval. The policy authorizes the Secretary of Senate to appoint alternate chairs.

Moved by Senator Blennerhassett, seconded by Senator Morelli, that Senate approve the elections to committees of the persons named in Appendix E page 20, with the exception of D. Freedman and R. Price, Alternate Chairs of the USAB, whose names are provided to Senate for information.

Carried 11-57

2. Operations Review (Appendix F, page 21)

a) Proposed interim amendment to the Senate composition

Moved by Senator Culham, seconded by Senator Colgan, that, effective immediately, the Deputy Provost position be added to the ex-officio roster of Senate on an interim basis until the final composition of Senate is determined by SORC and ratified by Senate.

Carried 11-58

(4 opposed, 1 abstention)

In response to a concern that faculty members constitute a majority of members on Senate, the Chair noted that the Deputy Provost was also a faculty member, as are most ex-officio positions on the Senate. (Exceptions are the AMS President, SGPS President, University Librarian and Associate VP and Dean of Student Affairs.)

b) SORC response to Senator Morelli's question on Notice of Motion procedure

The Chair drew attention to the answer provided in the report in Appendix F, page 22.

3. Academic Planning Task Force (Appendix G, page 23)

a) Presentation of Academic Plan <http://www.queensu.ca/saptf/>

Task Force Chair, P. Taylor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, made some introductory comments, noting that the Academic Planning Task Force (APTF) had consulted widely, and then had engaged in a review of ideas to produce the current document. He noted that the APTF was counting on the discussion and comments on the website over the next several weeks to help identify omissions and aspects to revisit, with a view to bringing back a more complete plan to the Senate in the next month or so.

¹ Minutes amended at the October 24, 2011 Senate meeting to provide details of question from Senator McIntire along with the response of the Provost
Queen's University at Kingston

The objective of the APTF was to identify Queen's strengths and vulnerabilities, provide priorities and directions in which to move as an institution, while leaving it to individual units and disciplines to decide on the extent and nature of implementation.

The APTF focus was mainly on the student learning experience because it believed that this was where the greatest attention was needed and where the most significant challenges lie. Everyone is facing difficult economic times. The APTF did not specifically address these in the plan, but were nevertheless mindful of the need for faculty, students and staff, to work together to make sure that students continue to have the exceptional student experience for which Queen's is known.

One of the main objectives was to achieve a more seamless connection between student learning to faculty research and back again. From that comes the emphasis on inquiry, communication, writing and the task-centred curriculum.

P. Taylor responded to two comments received by the APTF since the draft plan appeared.

1. Faculty student time: the time teacher and student spend together is highly valued both by students and faculty. The present Queen's configuration with a fixed number of faculty and students translates into a certain number of faculty teaching hours per student. This is a fixed ratio. Nothing recommended in the plan seeks to change that. The recommendations are focused on making that time count in two different ways: what faculty do and what students do, and when they do it – first, second, third or fourth year. One of the conclusions reached is that first and fourth year are two of the most critical points in the student trajectory and time allocation to those years requires careful consideration.
2. APTF member M. Jones circulated a personal comment about the plan and others had made comments over the past week. Situations will vary from discipline to discipline and it is fair to say that the plan needs to acknowledge this more explicitly. One example is the role of senior undergraduates in teaching. The approach may be very different in Engineering, Math and Psychology from History, Political Science and English. The second example is the teaching, or facilitation, of inquiry. P. Taylor spoke of his own interest to find ways to incorporate inquiry more effectively into the Mathematics and Engineering classroom experience. This is a very active area of pedagogical development in those disciplines as shown by current work by Eric Nasser at Harvard and Carl Wieman at UBC in Physics. However, disciplines such as English, History and Political Science already use an inquiry-based approach with fewer lectures and as many seminars as they can afford to run. Having said that, it is likely true that there remain ways to change and improve how things are done. The discussion in the plan has to be set at a high enough level to accommodate these differences.

Senator MacLean, Dean of Arts and Science, inquired about the expectations if Senate were to pass the plan document in its current form. In principle, the proposal contained interesting ideas, many of which would need further examination before implementation. While he could support the general principles embodied in the plan, particularly the four pillars, the 89 separate recommendations seemed highly prescriptive and at an operational level that needs to be informed with further information and data. It was at this level that it became difficult to whole-heartedly support the plan in its present form. He went on to speak to examples.

- The integration of teaching and research has been contained in the mission statement of the Faculty of Arts and Science for many years as a stated commitment to integrating excellence in research with exceptional teaching. More can certainly be done, but it is an intention that has been present for some time.

- With respect to the style of teaching and learning prescribed, the Dean strongly supported the view that faculty members should examine alternative, innovative and creative modes of teaching and adopt them where possible or indeed reassert the worth of their current approach. However it was also important to recognize the fundamental principle of academic freedom that faculty members have to determine what is best for their own courses.
- In a number of cases, Arts and Science and other faculties, are already doing some of the things that are suggested in the report. For example, Arts and Science has close partnerships with the Libraries, the Centre for Teaching and Learning and Information Technology Services in the development of new approaches to teaching. Also, for some time the Faculty has actively encouraged the development of continuing and distance studies. Blended learning initiatives are implemented, or about to be implemented, in a several departments.
- A number of the issues that are identified in the *Where Next* and *Imagining the Future* documents do not seem to be reflected in the plan. Its strong focus on the Faculty of Arts and Science skews a broader view

Senator MacLean asked whether the plan was to be adopted in detail or would it be seen as a package with *Where Next* and *Imaging the Future*, as a set of documents which in broad strokes leads to consideration of new and creative opportunities for faculty, staff and students. He suggested that Senate might want to consider embracing this broader view rather than adopting a plan that supplies a lot of operational details which remain open to scrutiny and possible amendment.

P. Taylor thanked Senator MacLean. While he concurred with the broader view, he noted that the APTF deliberately did not repeat some of the things that were well laid out in the two former documents. There are a lot of recommendations because of a desire to describe examples of what the APTF had in mind.

M. Jones responded to the suggestion that Queen's take *Imagining the Future* and *Where Next* in addition to whatever is produced by the task force as its Plan. He objected because *Where Next* was written before any consultation occurred, and *Imagining the Future* was written before much of the consultation was finished. The Academic Plan, as the Task Force set out to execute it, started with extensive consultation on specific issues, many of which had been voiced in objection to early stages of the planning process. The historical process is important. There are certain things in *Where Next* and *Imagining the Future* that may require reconsideration.

Senator Reznick commented that the four pillars are consonant with the strategic directions in the Faculty of Health Sciences. However, in general the document is undergraduate-centric and could be improved by more of a focus on graduate education as well as professional education. He believed that the Faculty of Health Sciences could support the directions that the plan takes.

P. Taylor acknowledged that the Plan document is Arts and Science oriented in many ways. However, the ideas about fundamental academic literacy apply to graduate school as well as to professional faculties; although in many ways these groups are less diverse and seem to have more internal control. The Task Force will look at that balance.

Senator Remenda, APTF member, said the Task Force believed that some pilot projects should be launched to explore certain of the recommendations and further study of particular recommendations will be necessary. The intention was not to ask Senate to embrace 89 recommendations as the answer. However, the recommendations were also framed following consultation with many people.

Senator Morelli thanked all members of the task force for their long and hard work on a very difficult project that must have consumed a lot of extra time that could have been devoted elsewhere. He encouraged every senator to read the document very carefully and be prepared to discuss it because it goes to the heart of the mission of the Senate.

He noted the positive aspect of the extensive consultations but that the feedback seems to have disappeared from the website and questioned whether it had been archived so that it will remain accessible.

Associate Secretary C. Russell explained that the content of the interactive consultation period was no longer a live feed on the website. It is, however, contained as references in the individual pillar documents.

P. Taylor added that because many of the comments applied to early drafts, and the APTF wanted to avoid any confusion between the final document and its earlier drafts. Given the comment, however, the APTF will review how it can achieve both ends.

M. Jones said that when the APTF started drafting, the website divided into two, so there was one page that had the drafts for the various sections and then there was still the old page that had the four pillars and all the community feedback that all went with them. There was also a page that was basically a schedule of activities and consultations. A lot of those were clickable because the takeaways were there. It is very important that that be made available again on the website because the whole point of that is so the whole community at any time can go on and say who said what, what was actually demanded in what ways this plan actually reflect the process. It is true that some sections of the plan have used that material in footnotes and documentation but those are just footnotes that often contain links that go back to those documents so people can actually check and see who said that and in what context. Not many people are going to want to do that, it is technically possible to make the materials available, and keep it available. There is nothing to be gained by deleting it from the website. It is one of the strongest things about the planning process.

In his view, this is the only academic plan process that has been conducted in such an open transparent and interactive basis. He thinks that we are stumbling now as we try to reach a comprehensive sort of global plan for the University. With an interactive website such as this, you can actually do one offs; you can do one year and you could plan for teaching of writing another year you can plan for what are we going to do with internet or online learning. Keeping the website, as it was, is critical.

L. Long (Undergraduate Trustee and Senate Observer) commented on the recommendations dealing with academic literacy. She expressed her appreciation for how much focus the plan has devoted to the topic because it is such a critical issue. Students are not coming to university well prepared to learn. She spoke in support of a UNIV100 first year course that would encompass an interdisciplinary curriculum, be seminar focused, with a pass and fail grading system. Another successful example is VIC1 program at Victoria College, at U of T, an elite program for high-school applicants that has thought-provoking seminar style courses. If Queen's could offer that opportunity to all first-year students it would really set the University apart. One concern would be assessing student progress in terms of academic literacy at the end of the first year; and, if they fail, to hold students back for a summer course for four weeks. This could potentially place some financial strain on students and prevent someone from getting summer employment.

Senator D. Moore, Graduate Student Senator, agreed that some more thought should be put into the UNIV100 course. He agreed with the comments that many of the principles described in the plan apply to the undergraduate experience. He felt that the integration of teaching and research could be better handled. More attention should be devoted to how graduate students combine those two aspects right now. He noted that Principle A suggests that graduate students, despite their research and their teaching, should be thought of as students only. He asked if the APTF had considered how

their recommendation for more undergraduate tutors and TAs could potentially have an impact on graduate student funding and teaching employment at current enrolment levels.

P. Taylor commented that, in the sciences, there is no shortage of work for graduate students. Graduate students all have full TAs but more are needed. Undergraduate students are a wonderful resource, but one has to be careful. M. Jones made this point during APTF discussions. To put undergraduate students in positions of teaching has to contribute notably to their learning. Whether there is a problem in some disciplines about undergraduate TAs taking TAships away from graduate students should be explored.

Senator Brouwer, Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS, responded that there could be problems if that were to occur. Also, some of the recommendations and ideas that have been put forward are very specific and do not necessarily hold true university-wide. Several people have commented about the undergraduate focus; however, there is a lot of scope within the framework presented on the four pillars to merge undergraduate and graduate strengths, and, in so doing, enhance the balanced academy at Queen's: Teaching and research working together.

Senator Remenda noted that Principle A was intended to protect graduate students from being viewed as a source of cheap labour. A better phrasing should be developed to avoid any confusion.

Senator Morelli referred to the dissenting opinion circulated by APTF member M. Jones and encouraged senators to read it. He then asked about proceeding forward at Senate and how the APTF saw their document coming back to Senate for eventual action. He also asked whether there would be a continuing role for the task force. He said it was his understanding that some members of the task force are no longer on Senate or at the University.

P. Taylor said the APTF would meet after Senate to review the comments, rewrite, and return with a revised document for Senate's consideration. The APTF will cease to exist once the plan is approved by Senate. The implementation of recommendations will become the responsibility of the leadership and members of the academic community in their individual units.

Senator Morelli asked about the membership of the APTF going forward. For example, M. Jones is not Senate this fall and there may be others who have moved on.

I. Reeve, former Graduate Student Senator and APTF member, said that if it became an issue and that Senate wished to replace him, he would understand. However, he also believed that the conclusion was close and he remained interested and was willing to finish the job. Apart from M. Jones, who had begun his sabbatical as planned in July, the only original member now absent was the undergraduate student C. Rudnicki who graduated and moved to another institution for further study. He participated during the summer. The AMS Vice-President, University Affairs, K. Slobodin attended the remaining meetings as an observer to ensure that the undergraduate student perspective is not lost.

Senator Reid, Queen's School of Business, asked two questions:

1. Did the committee obtain advice from any outside consultants of any kind?
2. Was any portion of the writing at all done by anybody who is not a member of the APTF?

In response to the first question, P. Taylor said that no advice had been sought from an outside consultant. As explained on the website during the process, the APTF sought out as many views as possible both passively by receiving posted comments and other submissions, and actively by attending faculty boards, holding town-halls, etc. All writing was done by members of the APTF who volunteered to take responsibility for various sections of the plan. Literature had been consulted throughout the process.

M. Jones spoke to his dissenting view, saying that his sense was that the plan was not ready to come forward yet. He did not think that any individual was at fault: the APTF is very small task force. Over the summer, membership became reduced. After he had left, about half the writing was done in a couple of months. In his view, this was just too short a time to put together something that would be worthy of being called the academic plan for Queen's University. He urged Senate to give more time to the project and maybe to replace members with others interested in these issues, capable of writing and who want to participate. He would have continued, but he had his other research to do. Senate should really think seriously about staffing the committee, giving it the resources it needs, and giving it the time it needs to do this right.

P. Taylor thanked everyone for the discussion. He invited further comments to be submitted to the website.

4. Academic Development (Appendix H, page 24)

a) 2010-2011 Omnibus Report

There were no questions or concerns.

5. Academic Procedures (Appendix I, page 25)

a) Annual Report 2010-2011

There were no questions or concerns.

b) Academic Integrity cases reviewed 2010-2011

University Registrar J.-A. Brady said no cases were reviewed in 2010-2011. She clarified that SCAP reviews the procedures related to cases that are not appealed. If a student appeals, the case goes to the University Student Appeals Board.

c) Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) training

There were no questions or concerns.

6. Advisory Research (Appendix J, page 28)

a) Annual Report 2009-2010

There were no questions or concerns.

7. Creative Arts and Public Lectures (Appendix K, page 39)

a) Annual Report 2010-2011

There were questions or concerns.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES

None received

The Chair noted that Queen's has one affiliated college, and on May 1, 2012, Queen's Theological College will enter a new phase of existence when the former QTC, now the Queen's School of Religion, merges with the University. The merger agreement was approved by the Queen's Board of Trustees on September 23, 2011 and the Board of Management of the QTC on April 26, 2011.

V MOTIONS (Appendix L, page 42)

1. Academic consideration for students voting in the October 6, 2011 provincial election

Moved by Senator Burford-Grinnell, seconded by Senator Moore, that, in accordance with Queen's normal accommodation provisions, the Senate encourages academic units and professors to be flexible in making alternate arrangements so that students can vote in the provincial election

on October 6, 2011 without concern for academic repercussion. Alternate arrangements would include but not be limited to the rescheduling of examinations, extending the deadlines for submission of assignments and providing reasonable access to materials covered during lectures for students who require a three hour absence from classes on that day to vote.

Carried 11-59

2. Concerning the official grading system of Queen's University - Notice of Motion

The Chair drew attention to the Notice of Motion in Appendix L, page 43 and noted that it would be presented to Senate at the next meeting on October 24, 2011.

VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE (Appendix M, page 55)

1. Research Report

There were no questions or comments.

2. Request to extend provisional status of the Sustainable Bioeconomy Centre

There were no questions or comments.

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES

None received

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

None received

Senate moved into Closed Session. Principal Woolf instructed all non-Senators to leave the room.

IX CLOSED SESSION – CONFIDENTIAL (Appendix N, page 56)

1. Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee

Moved by Senator Flanagan, seconded by Senator Dickey Young, that Senate approve the list of those to be invited to receive honorary degrees at the Spring and Fall Convocations in 2012 in Appendix N, page 56.

Carried 11-60

The Principal reminded senators that the list of nominees and alternates is strictly confidential until all invitees have replied and an announcement made in open session. About half of the convocation ceremonies have honorary doctorates and the other half have invited speakers, usually alumni or faculty members.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.