



Minutes

MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Thursday, February 18, 2010 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

Present: Principal Woolf (Chair) **Senators:** Archibald, Bevan, Blennerhassett, Boag, Brien, Ceci, Chaudhry, Christie, Colgan, Cordy, Culham, De Souza, Dimitrov, Dixon, Elliott, Flanagan, Fulford, Goodspeed, LaFleche, Laker, Lin, MacLean, McCormack, Medves, Newcomb, Notash, Oosthuizen, Pardy, Parente, Reid, Roberge, Rowe, Scott, Stairs, Stevens, Walker, Welsh, Woodhouse, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

Also Present: J-A. Brady, M. Campbell, S. Rigden, C. Sumbler, P. Watkin, R. Silverman, R. Barrack, Q. Wang, C. Davis.

I OPENING SESSION

The Chair welcomed new senator, S. Elliott, Dean of the Faculty of Education. He noted the recent election of new AMS president, S. Chowdhury. She will begin her term on Senate on May 1, succeeding M. Ceci.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Oosthuizen, that the agenda be adopted as circulated with the provision of a closed session at the end of the meeting to hear a report from the Principal.

Carried 10-07

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 28 January 2010 (Appendix A, page 1)

Moved by Senator Deane, seconded by Senator Medves, that the minutes of January 28, 2010 be adopted as circulated.

Carried 10-08

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

None

4. Chair's Report

Vision Statement and Academic Planning

The Principal noted he had received lots of feedback on his vision statement, "Where next? Toward a University Academic Plan," released January 15, 2010. He noted that the comments will help in the drafting of the plan over the summer by a team of academics, to be announced shortly. He has discussed academic planning at a recent student government session organized by AMS Academic Affairs Commissioner S. Gouinlock. The session at the January 28 Senate meeting was productive. More public sessions to discuss the plan will be scheduled.

Engaging with the local University Community

The Principal met with the boards of all professional schools and faculties last fall and has now been visiting academic departments – 19 so far – to learn about their exciting and innovative work. He has

also been hearing first-hand from those on the front lines about the challenges they face. He plans to complete these visits within the next two years.

Sustainability Commitment

On February 9, 2010, Principal Woolf signed the University and College Presidents' Climate Change Statement of Action for Canada, making Queen's the first university in Ontario to do this. It signals the University's determination to make sustainability one of its core values. The signing is testament to the advocacy of several Queen's groups including Queen's Backing Action on Climate Change (QBACC), the VPs (Academic) and (Finance and Administration) and their staff, the Sustainability Office and the academic researchers who have given their time and expertise.

External Relations

The Principal and S. Conway, Special Advisor to the Principal on External Relations, met with John Milloy, Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, in early February. The Principal spoke of the education sector and Queen's concern for preserving a high-quality educational experience in the Ontario university system. The Minister said he does not anticipate significant new investment in the current fiscal climate and that it was unlikely that significant increases in tuition will be allowed for the coming academic year. The Principal noted it is difficult to plan and to be accountable when the structure or quality of 90 per cent of our revenue is unknown. The Minister was interested in the Principal's previous experience at other universities in the country, particularly with respect to international student recruitment. The Principal offered to provide advice anytime. The next day, the Principal and B. Young, Chair of the Board of Trustees, attended a meeting of university board chairs and executive heads attended by Minister Milloy, where the topic of financial challenges was discussed.

5. Other Reports

a) Research Report (Appendix B, page 9)

VP (Research) K. Rowe highlighted recent outstanding lectures by Queen's Excellence in Research Award winners Wendy Craig and Martin Duncan. He also announced that the Ontario Government had awarded Michael Cunningham (Chemistry) with one of two Ontario Research Chairs in Green Chemistry and Engineering, worth \$1.25 million.

b) COU Orientation by Academic Colleague, Senator Oosthuizen (Oral)

Senator Oosthuizen gave a presentation entitled "An Introduction to COU," attached to the minutes.

II QUESTION PERIOD (Appendix C, page 10)

1. From Senator Christie regarding review process for the Academic Plan

1. Will members of the Queen's community have an opportunity to provide input and feedback into the academic plan between August and September when the preliminary report is brought to Senate?

2. Will members of the Queen's community have an opportunity to provide input and feedback into the academic plan in October and November before it is brought to Senate for approval in November 2010?

The Chair gave an oral response to both questions, stating that the answer was the same to both questions. He expects the academic group charged with writing the plan to complete its work by the end of August. The September 23, 2010 Senate meeting will be the first formal opportunity to comment on the academic plan. The university community will be able to submit comments on the document which will be available to the writers of the plan. The plan is expected to be presented for approval at the November 25, 2010 Senate meeting.

In answer to a question from Senator Reid, the Principal said there would be open forums for people to share their views in person as well as in writing. Observer M. Campbell asked if the drafts of the academic plan could be posted on the internet so that students and academics could review it. The

Principal noted that the academic committee writing the plan would not start its work until May, but he would raise that suggestion with them.

III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Academic Development (Appendix D, page 11)

c) Faculty of Applied Science Name Change

Dean K. Woodhouse noted that faculty and students had a passionate discussion about the name change. She clarified that this is a faculty and not a degree name change. Adding the word “Engineering” better describes what the faculty does and reduces confusion and will aid with recruiting.

Moved by Senator Woodhouse, seconded by Senator Oosthuizen that Senate approve the proposal to change the name of the “Faculty of Applied Science” to the “Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science,” effective immediately, and inform the Board of Trustees of this change.

Carried 10-09

Senators Dixon and Welsh were recorded as voting against the motion.

2. Advisory Research (Appendix E, page 17)

a) Proposed Amendments to the SNOLAB Institute Constitution

Senator Rowe noted that the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (SNO), approved by Senate, was first established in 1989 to operate a major particle astrophysics experiment two kilometers underground in the Creighton Mine in Sudbury, Ont. The SNO experiment is winding down and is transitioning to the operation of SNOLAB, a facility in which a series of international experiments, including several led by Queen’s researchers, will be conducted.

Changes to the constitution are required now because the current funding of SNOLAB runs out at the end of March. To resolve the issue, Industry Canada has asked the CFI to consider providing funds for the next two years. The CFI board will meet in early March to consider this request. A condition of the past CFI funding was a review of SNOLAB governance. The required changes would facilitate the SNO Institute Board moving from a Board of Trustees for the SNO experiment to the SNOLAB Institute Board of Management for the SNOLAB facility.

Moved by Senator Rowe, seconded by Senator MacLean, that the revised SNOLAB Institute Constitution be adopted.

Carried 10-10

3. Agenda (Appendix F, page 37)

a) Senate Meeting Dates 2010-2011

Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Santeramo, that the proposed Senate meeting dates for 2010-2011 be approved.

Carried 10-11

4. Operations Review

University Planning Committee Proposal (UPC) – Oral Update from the Chair

On behalf of SORC, Committee Chair, Senator Stairs presented the proposed revisions to the Senate for discussion and feedback:

1. A set of draft recommendations from SORC
2. A revised mandate and terms of reference for the UPC
3. Two options (A and B) for UPC membership composition

The above take into consideration feedback from the December 6, 2009 Board of Trustees meeting, the November 26, 2009 Senate meetings, SORC meetings and correspondence received. The draft is also posted on QShare for senators to review and send comments to SORC.

Timeline for Review Process

This process of review will repeat on March 6 when Senator Stairs and SORC members discuss their recommendations with the Board at 9:30 am in room 202 Robert Sutherland Hall.

SORC will review feedback from the Board and Senate meetings, and any QShare comments, when it meets again on March 10. SORC plans to finalize a set of UPC recommendations for approval by the Senate on March 25. The proposal will then be sent to the Board of Trustees for consideration at its meeting on April 30.

Senator Stairs outlined the following highlights of changes proposed by SORC:

- Deletion of a budget committee as a sub-committee of the UPC and assuming the establishment of a separate University Budget Development Committee involving the UPC integrally in the process of budget development. This keeps the budget development process in the university structure, with accountability via the Principal to the Board's Finance Committee;
- Proposed language is "review and comment" consistently throughout the document to clarify that the final authority for decision-making continues to reside with Senate and Board;
- Composition adjusted to reflect UPC's mandate as a participatory body, versus representational;
- Concern for equal participation by the Senate and the Board of Trustees addressed, along with ex-officio and non-voting participation from those whose expertise is most required;
- Two options for composition presented – one more defined, the other more open to be defined by the nominations process, with both options maintaining the recommended size – no more than 20;
- Chancellor and all associate VPs removed. Deans removed because the category of faculty and staff Senator includes all Deans;
- University Registrar and VP (Finance and Administration) added as non-voting members for their expertise and advice.
- Members are subject to nomination processes of the Senate and the Board and all elected members serve staggered terms;
- The UPC should meet at least bi-monthly, using technology and conferencing to enable members from the Board of Trustees who are not regularly on campus to participate.

The following comments and observations were made during the discussion:

Several senators expressed concern that the committee was still too large to function effectively and others the concern that representation from certain stakeholder groups was unbalanced or missing.

Senator Woodhouse (Dean, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science) expressed concern about a lack of a "de facto dean" or a dean's representative on the UPC.

Senator Walker (Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences) agreed, saying that deans who have greater responsibility and less accountability for planning will be placed in an impossible position. He noted an imbalance in representation in the composition model Option A. The Faculty of Health Sciences contains departments that are larger than other single faculties. Queen's used to have a VP Health Sciences. He pointed out that the Faculty has a long history and serves a unique role in the identity of the institution. The proposed revisions do not mention the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, whereas the original proposal listed the Dean as an observer.

Senator Reid commented that the number of members representing university management is too high. The composition was not one half Board, one half Senate but rather one third Board, one third Senate and one third management. He suggested a membership of six senators (elected), six trustees (elected), two deans (elected) and the principal who represents management and those who report to the Principal can attend as observers.

Senator Ceci (President of the AMS) expressed concerns about student members in both Option A and Option B. Option B guarantees neither a minimum nor maximum of student representatives. Under Option B, potentially the Rector could be the only student on the committee. Since there are very few two-year positions in the student Senate caucus, it would essentially mean that students from the Arts and Science and Applied Science faculties would be advantaged. Currently, the graduate and undergraduate trustees serve staggered terms on the Board. Since the membership on the UPC is also for staggered terms, this would mean that a representative from either undergraduates or graduates would consistently fill that spot on the UPC instead of either-or.

Senator R. Chaudhry suggested a compromise in which six members are elected but specify a minimum of one student from the Senate or Board and a minimum of one or two deans, and then leave it to the nominating committee to determine the length of the terms. This would ensure that the deans and the student senators were not under-represented.

In response to a question from Senator Boag, the Principal confirmed that the former Principal's Advisory Committee on the Budget had ceased to meet before his arrival. Currently the budget is developed by the senior administration.

Senator Cordy referred to the mandate of the Senate Budget Review Committee (SBRC) and expressed his concern that the Senate would lose its chance to review the budget under the terms of SORC's revised UPC proposal.

Senator Medves, a former chair of the SBRC, explained that the mandate of the SBRC limits the committee's role to a retrospective examination of the approved budget. Under its mandate "to advise the Senate on the financial implications" of new programs, centres, chairs, etc. the SBRC's power was limited to sending back individual proposals to request more complete information. SBRC was not able to comment adequately on the impact on the University as a whole. The recommendation to establish a Principal's Budget Development Committee, if constituted correctly, would be more timely and permit a constructive contribution toward budget development, instead of commenting retrospectively.

In response to Senator Oosthuizen about who would review new programs and centres, Senator Medves replied that many of the comments from SBRC would have already been made by other committees such as the Senate Committee Academic Development (SCAD).

The Principal clarified that the UPC proposal that originated in his office is now a SORC initiative. He noted that at the December 6 meeting, Board members had expressed reservations about the original proposal of a Budget Subcommittee. The intent is to move in a progressive way so as to strengthen the relatively minimal role Senate currently has to make retrospective comments on the budget. In its draft proposal, SORC provides a compromise between having a Budget Subcommittee of the UPC and a separate standalone committee which has links through members from the UPC.

Senator MacLean (Dean of Arts and Science) questioned how the UPC would fit into the budget planning process undertaken by the deans, which takes a great deal of time and consultation. He asked if the UPC would advise the deans to change their budget planning process and timeline. He agreed with Senator Cordy that it is important for faculty, staff and students to have their voices heard in the planning process. He disagreed with Senator Walker, saying that there are difficulties with representational membership on the UPC, and advocated a more broadly constituted group. He asked how the work of the UPC would fit into the overall university planning process and where the core of the planning would take place in the future – in the faculties or within the new body.

Senator LaFleche (Staff Senator) expressed concern that without specifying membership in Option A and Option B, there potentially would not be an elected staff representative on the UPC.

Senator Stairs observed that SORC had reduced the number of members by two in Option A and by three in Option B compared to the original proposal. While “Observers” were removed in these options, this category remains available to individuals or groups in accordance with existing Senate policy on attendance of non-members. Senator Stairs also indicated in response to Senator MacLean that planning remained the province of the deans and faculties; the purpose of the UPC was to provide a review of faculty plans and other initiatives within the context of overall university planning.

On behalf of SORC, Senator Stairs thanked senators for a very helpful discussion that would contribute to shaping a final proposal for Senate and Board approval.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES

None Received

V MOTIONS

None Received

VI COMMUNICATIONS

1. Annual Report of the Council on Employment Equity

Senator Deane noted that senators would find the report interesting and that the Council on Employment Equity is eager to be involved in ongoing discussions with the leaders of different units.

2. UN Invites Universities to Sign Academic Impact Statement

The Chair noted that he was seeking Senate’s advice on the document, signed by one other Ontario university, McMaster, and whether Queen’s should sign up. Senator Oosthuizen noted that in Quebec universities had signed as a group and he wondered whether COU should consider signing as a group. The Chair noted it would be a good idea except for the fact that McMaster University had already signed on. However, he advised that Senator Oosthuizen, who is Queen’s COU Academic Colleague, might wish to suggest the idea at the next Academic Colleagues meeting.

In response to a question from Senator Walker, the Chair replied that signing the statement would require some action each year and that Queen’s in the normal course of its business could satisfy this requirement.

Moved by Senator Stevens, seconded by Senator Oosthuizen that Senate supports the concept of signing the UN Academic Impact Statement.

Carried 10-12

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES

None Received

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

VP (Academic) P. Deane updated Senate on a new Quality Assurance Framework, approved by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). The Council had been working for a year and a half on the Framework, which would move the function of quality assurance to a Quality Council. New program approvals and cyclical reviews conducted by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS) and the Internal Academic Review process for undergraduate programs would be combined under a new quality assurance protocol currently under development. The new Framework will save money and streamline the process. Senator Deane said that the change will ultimately require revisions to the Senate Policy on Internal Academic Reviews.

Introduction to COU

**An Introduction to the Council
of Ontario Universities (COU)**

Introduction to COU

ORIGINS

The organization was formed in 1962 in response to a need for institutional participation in the educational reform and expansion then taking place. The executive head of each of Ontario's provincially assisted universities comprised the committee and it was originally known as the *Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario* (CPUO). The group was involved in policy and program initiatives implemented by the government during the universities' growth period in the '60s.

Introduction to COU

ORIGINS (continued)

The committee was later enlarged to include two representatives from each member institution and each associate institution: the executive head (university president, principal or rector) and an academic colleague appointed by each university's senior academic governing body.

In 1971, the committee changed its name to the *Council of Ontario Universities* (COU).

Introduction to COU

Membership

COU members (the universities) are defined by two factors:

- (1) their relationship to the Ontario government
 - a. all COU members are provincially assisted universities in Ontario, receiving a significant proportion of their annual operating budget directly from the provincial government
 - b. all COU members have the power to grant university degrees specifically conferred by a legislative or parliamentary act or charter, not limited to a single professional field

Introduction to COU

(2) their identity as universities, which includes but is not limited to the following characteristics:

- a. an approved, clearly articulated and widely known and accepted mission statement and academic goals that are appropriate to a university and that demonstrate its commitment to: (i) research, scholarship, academic inquiry and the advancement of knowledge, (ii) based on (i), teaching and other forms of dissemination of knowledge, in which the delivery of university degree-level programs is the major activity, (iii) service to the community.

Introduction to COU

- b. governance and an administrative structure appropriate to its mission statement and goals, including: (i) Authority vested in academic staff who are involved in decisions affecting academic programs including admissions, content, graduation requirements/standards, and related policies and procedures through membership on an elected academic senate or other appropriate senior academic body representative of academic staff, (ii) An independent board of governors or appropriate equivalent that is committed to public accountability and functions in an open and transparent manner, has control over the institution's finances, administration and appointments, includes appropriate representation from the institution's external community (including the general public), academic staff, students and alumni, uses the institution's resources to advance its mission and goals.

Introduction to COU

c. undergraduate degree programs characterized by breadth and depth in the liberal arts and sciences, and first professional degree programs (such as medicine, law, teacher education, business, engineering) that have a significant liberal arts and/or sciences component

d. highly qualified academic staff who engage in scholarship, academic inquiry, creative activities and research, and are provided by the institution with appropriate time and support to do so

e. an atmosphere conducive to intellectual freedom and responsibility in which academic staff and students are expected to display a high degree of intellectual honesty, integrity and accountability.

Introduction to COU

MEMBERS:

1. Algoma University	2. Brock University
3. Carleton University	4. University of Guelph
5. Lakehead University	6. Laurentian University
7. McMaster University	8. Nipissing University
9. University of Ontario Institute of Technology	10. University of Ottawa
11. Queen's University	12. Ryerson University
13. University of Toronto	14. Trent University
15. University of Waterloo	16. University of Western Ontario
17. Wilfrid Laurier University	18. University of Windsor
19. York University	

Introduction to COU

Associate Members: 1. Ontario College of Art & Design
2. Royal Military College of Canada

Introduction to COU

Council Membership

Those eligible for membership on the Council are:

1. the executive heads of those institutions that have been admitted to membership in COU.
2. one colleague from each such institution, selected for membership by the academic senate or equivalent senior academic body from among the academic staff who are current members of that body or who could be appointed to it while serving as a colleague and who shall hold office for a term of three years, renewable.

Introduction to COU

Prof. Bonnie M. Patterson was appointed President and CEO of COU for a three-year term in 2009. She had been serving as Interim President of COU since September and had previously served as President of COU from 1995 to 1998. She served as President and Vice-Chancellor of Trent University from 1998 to June 2009 and was chair of AUCC from 2005 to 2007. She has also served as Dean of Business at Ryerson University and chaired and taught at its School of Administration and Information Management. She holds a BA and MLS from the University of Western Ontario.

Introduction to COU

FINANCE

According to the COU Constitution:

1. The chief source of financial support of the Council shall be subscriptions paid by the universities whose executive heads are members of the Council.
2. The scale of membership subscriptions shall be set by action of the Council.
3. The Council may receive additional financial support from other sources
4. The Council shall conduct its business affairs through COU Holding Association Inc., an Ontario corporation without share capital, registered as a charitable organization under the Income Tax Act of Canada.

Introduction to COU

COU Committees

1. Executive Committee,
2. Government and Community Relations
3. Relationships with Other Postsecondary Institutions,
4. Nominating,
5. Ontario University Athletics (OUA) Liaison,
6. Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC) Advisory Board.

Introduction to COU

AFFILIATES

1. Council of Chairs of Ontario Universities (CCOU), 2. Council of Ontario University Secretaries (COUS), 3. Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine (COFM), 4. Council of Sr. Administrative Officers - Universities of Ontario (CSAO-UO) & its affiliates, 5. Association of Auxiliary Services Administrators, 6. Association of Computing Services Directors (ACSD), 7. Association of Ontario University Human Resources Professionals (AOUHRP), 8. Committee on Space Standards & Reporting , 9. Council of Environmental Health & Safety Officers (CEHSO), 10. Council of Finance Officers - Universities of Ontario (COFO-UO), 11. Ontario Association of College & University Security Administrators (OACUSA), 12. Ontario Association of Physical Plant Administrators (OAPPA), 13. Ontario University Purchasing Management Association (OUPMA), 14. Council on University Planning & Analysis (CUPA), 15. Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV),, 32. Ontario Universities' Public Affairs Council (OUPAC).

Introduction to COU

Ontario Universities Application Centre (OUAC)

This provides a centralized admission application service for the province's universities (including the Ontario College of Art & Design). OUAC processes applications to all full-time undergraduate programs; medical, law, teacher education and rehabilitation sciences programs; selected graduate studies programs; and several part-time study programs.

The Application Centre also provides statistical research on enrolment and liaison, produces the bi-annual publication of *INFO* magazine, administers educational surveys, electronically processes university transcripts, and provides academic data and other services to universities as requested.

Introduction to COU

One of the major purposes of COU is to deal with external problems being experienced by the Ontario university system as a whole. They thus coordinate and plan the lobbying of provincial government members and members of other political parties regarding the university system, they work with the provincial government in the development of policies that effect the university sector, they coordinate efforts to inform the public about the importance of the university system in Ontario and about the problems the system is facing and they try to develop frameworks for interactions between universities and colleges in the province.

Introduction to COU

COU also works to inform school guidance councilors and high school students about university programs in the province and about entrance requirements. They organize the annual universities fair in Toronto.

At the federal level they work with AUCC in lobbying and working with the federal government particularly concerning student financial support and research funding.

Introduction to COU

COU Updates

Approximately 5-6 times a year COU prepares a summary of the status of subject areas that are receiving particular attention. These COU Updates, while not meant to be for full public release, are made available for distribution in the universities. They will be circulated with the colleague's report to senate. Topics dealt with in recent Updates are:

University Operating Funding; Capital Funding; Application Numbers for Next Academic Year; Student Mobility and Pathways; Quality Assurance; University Pension Plans; Greening of Campuses; PST/GST; Medical School Expansion.

Introduction to COU

Colleague Working Papers

These papers, written by one or more of the Academic Colleagues, deal with problems and concerns of university faculty. They are, after acceptance by the council, made available on the COU website. There are approximately 21 working papers (the name may change in the near future) available at present.

Introduction to COU

Colleague Working Papers (continued)

1. LEARNING DISABILITIES: A GUIDE FOR FACULTY AT ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES, John Logan, Academic Colleague (Carleton University) - 2009

2. THE ONTARIO TRANSFER CREDIT SYSTEM: A Situation Report, Philippe Constantineau, Academic Colleague (Royal Military College of Canada) – 2009

3. THE CHALLENGE OF PARTICIPATORY TECHNOLOGIES FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING AT ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES, Sylvie Albert, Academic Colleague (Laurentian University) and Brian Campbell, Academic Colleague (UOIT) – 2008

:

Introduction to COU

19. THE ROLE AND STATE OF ONTARIO GRADUATE EDUCATION, Dennis Forcese, Academic Colleague (Carleton University) and Daniel Woolf, Academic Colleague (McMaster University) - 2002

20. INCREASED INTERGRATION OF PROGRAMS IN ENGINEERING AND THE HUMANITIES, Patrick Oosthuizen, Academic Colleague (Queen's University) and Laurie Garred, Academic Colleague (Lakehead University) – 2002

21. THE LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES – BACCALAUREATE DEGREE: ARE 15 CREDITS ENOUGH? Jocelyn B. Aubrey, Academic Colleague (Trent University) - 2002

Introduction to COU

Collective Autonomy

A History of the Council of Ontario Universities, 1962-2000
by *Edward Monahan*

Collective Autonomy: A History of the Council of Ontario Universities, 1962-2000 is the first full-length account of an organization that has played a major role in the development of the university system in Ontario. Edward J. Monahan served as the council's chief executive officer for over fifteen years. This is his insider's account, enhanced by archival material, of the key role the universities played in planning the high academic quality of the Ontario provincial university system.

Introduction to COU

REPORTING BACK TO SENATES.

All academic colleagues report to their senates after full Council meetings (normally twice a year) and after some Academic Council Meetings. This policy is followed at Queen's.

Introduction to COU

ACRONYMS

Acronyms abound in COU literature and COU has a list on their webpage that gives about 120 commonly encountered acronyms! Typical entries are:

A

ACAATO	Association of Colleges of Applied Arts & Technology of Ontario
ACSLC	Application Centres' Senior Liaison Committee
ACSD	Ontario Association of Computing Services Directors
ADM	Assistant Deputy Minister
AHSC	Academic Health Sciences Centres
APIMG	Assessment Program for International Medical Graduates
ATOP	Access to Opportunities Program
AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada

B

C

CAAT	College of Applied Arts and Technology
CAURA	Canadian Association of University Research Administrators
CAUT	Canadian Association of University Teachers
