



# Minutes

## MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Thursday, January 20, 2011 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

**Present:** Principal Woolf in the Chair **Senators:** Basser, Bevan, Bowers, Brien, Brouwer, Chaudhry, S. Chowdhury, Christie, Colgan, Colwell, Cordy, Crowell, Culham, Dacin, De Souza, Detomasi, Dimitrov, Fachinger, Farewell, Fisher, Flanagan, Goodspeed, Jones, Kim, Kwong, LaFleche, Lamoureux, Liss, Lyon, MacLean, Morelli, Notash, Oosthuizen, Pardy, Pierce, Reeve, Reid, Remenda, Saunders, Silverman, Stairs, Summers, Tolmie, Wang, Whitehead, Woodhouse, Young, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

**Also Present:** H. Abdollah, C. Beach, J-A. Brady, I. Bujara, C. Coupland, R. Coupland, L. Dal Cin, C. Davis, N. Day, A. Girgrah, G. MacAllister, S. Marlin, K. O'Brien, L. Peterson, S. Rigden, H. Smith, P. Taylor, S. Verbeek, K. Wallace, P. Watkin

Preliminary Proceedings: Principal Woolf presented the *T. Geoffrey Flynn Advancement Champion Award* to P. Taylor, Professor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

### I OPENING SESSION

The Chair welcomed new senators J. Bowers, P. Fachinger and A. Summers. He reviewed the Rules of Procedure for Senate meetings and noted that some Senate reports for information, formerly listed under I Opening Session, had moved to VI Communications and Reports submitted to Senate.

#### 1. Adoption of Agenda

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

**Carried 11-01**

#### 2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 25 November 2010 (Appendix A, page 1)

**Moved by Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator Culham, that the minutes of November 25, 2010 be adopted as circulated.**

**Carried 11-02**

#### 3. Business Arising from the Minutes (Appendix B, page 13)

##### a) **Vote Result: Academic Plan Task Force**

There were no questions or comments.

#### 4. Principal's Report

##### External relations

Principal Woolf met with Kingston and the Islands MPP John Gerretsen and Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities John Milloy, who was in Kingston January 20 as part of a province-wide tour. The minister is meeting with students to discuss affordability of post-secondary education and the province's recent \$74,000 announcement about credit transfer, which would increase opportunities for credit transfer between colleges and universities. Queen's will need to examine how much it can do. Space challenges exist due to Queen's high retention rate and limited capacity for upper-year transfers

in many programs. The Principal is to meet January 21 with St. Lawrence College President Chris Whitaker to discuss credit transfer.

The Principal said that Minister Milloy was generally receptive to the idea of the university's plans for a new teaching facility and its related enrolment growth targets. The university's enrolment planning task force continues to work on this issue.

The Principal spent a day in Ottawa last week, part of a strategy to raise Queen's profile on Parliament Hill. He spoke to senior embassy officials from India, Australia and Saudi Arabia about increasing Queen's presence in those countries. He met with two federal deputies, both Queen's alumni, to discuss the new military and veteran health initiative, a great opportunity for collaboration between Queen's, RMC and the City of Kingston. Canada is the only NATO country without a research program in this area.

The Principal will travel to Australia in two weeks. He will attend the board meeting of the Matariki Network of Universities. Formed last year, the international group consists of seven mid-sized, research-intensive, undergraduate-focused institutions: Dartmouth College (U.S.A.), Durham University (United Kingdom), University of Otago (New Zealand), University of Tübingen (Germany), University of Western Australia (Australia), Uppsala University (Sweden) and Queen's. Last November, Queen's held the network's first researcher workshop on renewable energy. The Principal will also visit several Australian universities to reinforce Queen's existing ties and to discuss trends in higher education. Australian universities have considerable experience, positive and negative, in internationalization efforts than Canadian universities. This is an opportunity to learn about these experiences. The Principal will also attend alumni events in Canberra and Sydney.

#### **Senate Academic Plan Task Force**

The Principal met January 19 with the task force. He was pleased to see that the work is under way, grateful to the members for their commitment to this important initiative, and looking forward to progress reports to Senate. This is the latest step in a process that began nearly a year ago with the release of the Principal's vision document, *Where Next?* The process passed through the work of the Academic Plan Writing Team in the summer and will culminate in a clear expression of the University's priorities, its direction and that will serve as a map for the Principal, senior administrators, department heads, graduate coordinators and others as we move forward. He thanked all participants for their hard work so far on the process. The role of the task force is to consider areas where consensus has not yet been reached and then develop a model for Senate approval. The plan will also guide continuing discussions with government, donors, prospective students and the broader Queen's community. Even if the university were in good financial shape, it would still conduct an academic plan exercise to know what its priorities are in order to strategically allocate resources. The extension of the deadline into 2011 allows for more discussion of these issues.

#### **Inquiry@Queen's**

The Chair invited Senator Remenda to speak about the upcoming undergraduate conference, Inquiry@Queen's, which takes place March 10-11 in the Stauffer Library. The conference is now inviting submissions. <http://iatq.ca>

### **5. Provost's Report**

#### **Enrolment Planning Task Force**

The Provost updated Senate on the work of the Enrolment Planning Task Force, which he chairs. At the last Senate meeting, he reported that, for 2011-12, the task force is recommending a maximum increase of 100 first-year students. This would put the University at capacity. Residences are overcrowded and teaching space is insufficient. The task force is examining ways of changing this. He will be submitting to Senate an interim report on long-term projections and ways to address the capacity issue.

### **Budget update**

The Provost has formed the Provost Advisory Budget Committee to guide the Principal and the Provost on budget decisions. The committee is reviewing the Academic Initiatives Fund to determine how to allocate the \$2 million in the fund. Difficult decisions will have to be made as the University plans its budget for the next three years.

### **University's financial situation**

After the December 3 Board of Trustees meeting, VP (Finance and Administration) C. Davis and the Provost released a financial update to the University Community which projects a \$4.6-million shortfall, compared to the \$3.8 million originally projected for this year. This in-year projection is indicative of the ongoing challenges facing Queen's and the broader public sector. The statement is on the web at [www.queensu.ca/financialupdate](http://www.queensu.ca/financialupdate).

### **Diversity and Equity**

The Provost has asked A. Husain, Director of Educational Equity and Diversity Projects to update Senate on the work of his task force at the March Senate meeting. Details about the task force are on the web at [www.queensu.ca/vpac/det](http://www.queensu.ca/vpac/det)

## **6. Other Reports requested by Senate**

- a) **Coordinator of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms – Annual Report 2009-2010** (Appendix C, page 14)  
There were no questions or comments.
- b) **Associate Vice-Principal and Dean of Student Affairs – Annual Report 2009-2010** (Appendix D, page 21)  
There were no questions or comments.

## **II QUESTION PERIOD**

None Received

## **III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

### **1. Academic Plan Task Force**

#### **a) Oral Report by P. Taylor, Chair.**

P. Taylor reported that the SAPTF has met twice so far to refine its agenda. Queen's is not the only university struggling to prioritize its academic programs and services. Queen's has to come to a clear sense of its teaching and research mission. The task is not only to formulate ideas; the task force must also set a structure in place to ensure these ideas are realized.

The task force will:

- Have a website, which will act as a bulletin board and sounding board for the university community
- Meet with others, possibly the whole community to respond to a general proposal
- Meet with specific groups to ask for their views on a specific set of issues.

P. Taylor remarked on a number of parallel planning exercises taking place:

- Strategic Research Plan
- Capital Campaign
- Campus Plan (buildings)
- Enrolment Plan (growth)
- Branding Exercise.

None of these are independent of the Academic Plan and all will be sharing information and ideas.

He noted that the task force will be sharing its work with the Senate and thanked senators for their support.

In answer to a question about the approval process, the Principal said that the Academic Plan will go to Senate for approval and then to a number of bodies, including:

- The Board of Trustees for information (since it is not strategic or financial, the trustees do not approve it)
- University administrative offices as a plan for distributing resources over the next few years
- Senate and other committees, such as the committee examining the Strategic Research Plan.

It will be a living document, circulated and consulted with a high degree of frequency instead of going into a filing cabinet.

In response to a question from Senator MacLean, who noted widespread concern last year, particularly from the Faculty of Arts and Science about adequate consultation on the plan with students, faculty and staff, P. Taylor said that communication and consultation would continue in a strategic manner using several means including an interactive website, focused meetings and focus groups.

**2. Academic Procedures (Appendix E, page 28)**

**a) Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates, 2009 and 2010 Convocations**

**Moved by Senator Reid, seconded by Senator MacLean, that the Official Convocation Program be included in the Senate Minutes as the official record of those receiving degrees, diplomas and certificates at the 2010 Spring and Fall Convocations.**

**Carried 11-03**

**b) Revision to Policy on Rescinding Degrees**

**Moved by Senator Reid, seconded by Senator Silverman, that the revision to section 1 of the Senate Policy on Rescinding Degrees as outlined in Appendix Eb, page 29, be approved.**

**Carried 11-04**

SCAP Chair C. Beach noted that this revision clarifies the outcome when an administrative error has been made.

**3. Advisory Research (Appendix F, page 30)**

**a) Development of a Process for Review and Revisions of the Queen's Strategic Research Plan**

**Moved by Senator Liss, seconded by Senator Reeve, that Senate approve the Strategic Research Plan Revision Process as outlined in Appendix F, pages 31 to 32.**

**Carried 11-05**

Senator Liss noted that the current plan was previously revised in 2003 and 2006 and was due for revision, given that it serves a variety of purposes.

Senator MacLean observed that the June to September had been set aside for community consultation and that during that time it is sometimes difficult to get feedback.

Senator Liss replied that several mechanisms will be used including an interactive website, twitter and facebook to facilitate dialogue. The 12- to 14-month time frame will also ensure adequate consultation.

The Principal noted that the process is proceeding in tandem with the academic plan process.

- 4. Educational Equity** (Appendix G, page 33)  
**a) Response to the Human Rights and Equity Report 2006-2009**  
There were no questions or comments.

- b) Response to the University Student Appeal Board (USAB) report and Queen's University Human Rights Policy and Procedure: Harassment, Discrimination and Accommodation**

**Moved by Senator Notash, seconded by Senator Chaudhry, that the SEEC response to the referral of the University Student Appeal Board (USAB) report and Queen's University Human Rights Policy and Procedure: Harassment, Discrimination and Accommodation be referred to the Working Group to review the Harassment/Discrimination Complaint Policy and Procedure for its consideration.**

**Carried 11-06**

In response to a question from Senator Notash, H. Smith, Chair of the Working Group to review the Harassment/Discrimination Complaint Policy and Procedure clarified that the working group will examine the suggestions and that when the policy is presented to the Senate, senators would have that opportunity to discuss what was included and why.

- 5. Nominating** (Appendix H, page 77)  
**a) Elections**

**Moved by Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator Culham, that Senate approve the election of those named in the report in Appendix H, page 77, to the committees indicated.**

**Carried 11-07**

- 6. Operations Review** (Appendix I, page 79)  
**a) Scheduling of Regular Senate Meetings**

**Moved by Senator Farewell, seconded by Senator Colgan, that the Rules of Procedure of the Senate, section "I. 1. Meetings," be amended to state that the meetings of Senate shall normally occur on the fourth Tuesday of each month at 3:30 pm, as outlined in the chart in Appendix 1a, page 80. This change shall take effect September 1, 2011.**

**Carried 11-08**

The Principal noted that the traditional meeting day, Thursday, had caused a number of external conflicts and he was grateful to SORC for recommending the change to a day earlier in the week, and to Senate for accepting it.

- b) Policy regarding publicizing Senators' email addresses**

**Moved by Senator Farewell, seconded by Senator Culham, that senators' names and email addresses be published and updated as required in a directory on the University Secretariat website.**

**Carried 11-09**

The University Secretariat was instructed to publish email addresses in list form and arrange for encryption of the addresses to cut down on spam traffic.

*Senate moved into Informal Session*

c) **Functions of the Senate**

**Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Crowell, that the Functions of Senate be considered in an informal session chaired by the Principal.**

**Carried 11-10**

The Chair noted that 35 to 40 minutes had been scheduled to discuss SORC's proposed amendments to the Functions of Senate, in the report in Appendix Ic, page 83.

SORC Chair, Senator Stairs presented the background on the reasons why SORC undertook a review of the Functions of Senate. The PowerPoint presentation, including four questions to be discussed by senators, is attached to the minutes.

**1. Should Senate have an overall purpose?**

Senators made the following comments in reference to the chart in Appendix Ic, page 84:

- An overall purpose statement is useful
- The word "purpose" is weaker than the word "function;" to state the function of Senate as a purpose weakens its effect
- Document defines the authority of Senate – to state this as a purpose is "aspirational" and makes it easier to overcome; replace "purpose" with jurisdiction
- SORC should get legal advice regarding any proposed changes to the functions of Senate
- Rationale for change section should have more developed rationales
- Replace "purpose" with "central or primary function."

Senator Stairs noted that SORC had consulted already with University Lawyer D. Kelly on some of the proposed changes. The Principal said he would ask her to render a response to all the proposed changes.

**2. SORC proposes to remove the phrase "the well-being of students" and insert it in the purpose statement. SORC thinks it is too complex to identify as a single function. What do you think?**

Senators' comments:

- It is crucial for the wellbeing of students to remain as a function of Senate due to its importance. The spirit is not captured in the purpose of Senate, which waters down the intent. It is important that students have Senate's support. It is important for students that Senate is, at end of the road, a good gesture as well as an important avenue. Benefit outweighs the harm.
- Senate no longer has the same paternalistic role but ultimately students' wellbeing is Senate's responsibility
- Students Affairs' mission is to foster the health and wellness of students, but the ultimate responsibility rests with Senate

- The rationale does not adequately explain why Senate is being stripped of this responsibility
- Senate is responsible for the academic wellbeing of students: if nothing is broken, then why are we trying to fix or change this?
- Senate acts as an umbrella for the non-academic living and the learning environment
- Statement in the current Function 11 is the essence of Queen's – that its highest academic body cares about its students
- Suggestion to change phrase in proposed Function 14 to "members of the university community"
- Senate has ultimate responsibility and the change dilutes the potential role of Senate rather than the actual role
- Senate may shoulder more responsibility than it needs to have; it is important to be careful not to take more responsibility than what is achievable.

Coordinator of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms H. Smith noted that the Senate Policy on Student Appeals, Rights & Discipline (SARD) has an academic component and that appeal processes exist for both academic and non-academic procedures.

### **3. Do the functions of Senate, as proposed, diminish the authority of Senate?**

Senators' comments:

- Yes, Senate's authority would diminish under the proposed revisions, and with unintended consequences due to the choice of certain words. "Approve" is passive; Old Function 3 says "establish." A new structure is needed. If it establishes the jurisdiction of Senate, then suggest that Senate has the authority over 1. 2. 3. Avoids watering down.
- Over the years, Senate delegated some of its responsibilities, but without the intent to give away final authority. Full legal opinion is essential because of this. It would be wrong to eliminate functions just because these functions have been delegated in the past.
- Existing Function 3 (To establish, subject to the ratification of the Board of Trustees, any faculty, school, institute, department) diminishes the power of Senate; Senate may miss an opportunity to dismantle a centre or institute
- Word changes from "establish" to "approve" and "function" to "purpose" will mean a loss of power; Senate should keep that authority in principle
- Functions 5, 6 and 7 should not be combined in new Function 4 without explaining the rationale. Function 4 is too broad and not specific enough to include what Senate actually does. For example, does it include the Library and computer systems? Linking functions to Senate committees is a clearer way to do this
- Devolving authority is dangerous; Senate has devolved much of its authority
- The statement on Senate operates needs revising. If new changes were declared to be bylaws they could be modified down the road, under the authority of the original document
- Senate's jurisdiction is already established by the Royal Charter; Senate does not have the power to expend or diminish it.

Principal Woolf noted that the Queen's University Planning Committee (QUPC) serves in an advisory capacity only.

### **4. What general responses do you have to the proposed purpose and functions of Senate?**

- This document should describe what Senate can do, not what Senate is doing or did in the past; it should define the ability, not what it is carrying out. It is a broader document.
- SORC proposed document is a valuable resource but more work is required
- Proposed Function 4 is a backward approach; the planning committee's mission should not overstep boundaries of Senate – same with the QUQAP
- Old Function 11 was complex and difficult to understand, but the proposed Function 6 is clear; the functions of Senate are moving forward
- SORC should explain what good or bad things happen if change takes place. Do not lose sight of the fact senators are working to make Queen's a better place – no hidden agenda here
- The David Mullan document is worth reading.  
<http://senatefacultycaucus.files.wordpress.com/2011/01/david-mullan-analysis-of-sorc-revisions-to-functions-of-the-senate-6-jan-2011.pdf>
- May not like his review but there may be some merit in his comments
- SORC members should read and comment on the Mullan paper
- Stop wasting money on legal opinions because you usually get the one you want by asking the right questions
- Let us not build a moat around Senate; we all want the institution to improve.

Senator Stairs thanked senators for their comments. Senator Culham, a member of SORC, noted that SORC made some revisions to its proposal after reading the Mullan document.

**Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Reeve, that the Informal Session now rise.**

**Carried 11-11**

### *Senate resumed its Regular Business*

- 7. Orientation Activities Review Board** (Appendix J, page 91)
  - a) Annual Report to Senate on Orientation 2010**  
There were no questions or comments.
- 8. Principal's Ad Hoc Committee to Draft a Safe Disclosure Policy** (Appendix K, page 98)
  - a) Policy and Procedures for Safe Disclosure reporting and investigation**

**Moved by Senator Silverman, seconded by Senator Colgan, that Senate approve the Queen's University Policy and Procedures for Safe Disclosure Reporting and Investigation and forward it to the Board of Trustees for ratification.**

**Carried 11-12**

Senator Silverman noted that the purpose of the new policy is to protect members of the Queen's community who make good-faith disclosures of alleged improper acts. The new policy does not supersede but instead complements any existing University policies and procedures or collective agreements governing this issue. The new policy is not meant as a second avenue for disclosers who first access another University policy or procedure and are dissatisfied with the outcome.

He thanked Professor Emeritus L. Monkman, who served as the Principal's Delegate and Chair of the committee.

In response to a question from Senator Notash, H. Smith, Co-ordinator, Dispute Resolution Mechanisms, stated that the policy would allow a person wishing to make a disclosure to come to the University Secretariat and set out the concern, assuming there is not another policy that is better suited to address the issue. Through the University Secretariat, it would be brought to the attention of a Responsible Officer to move the issue forward. The onus would be on the first person



responding to determine a course of action. If there is an investigation, written recommendations would be provided to the Responsible Officer. The procedure set out in the policy ensures that the matter moves forward and that some conclusion is reached. The information that it elicits may result in changes to existing policies or practices, and the discloser would be informed if this were the outcome. If it happens that someone ignores a concern that has been raised, or the alleged improper act involves the Responsible Officer who would look into the matter, the report will be directed to the person to whom the Responsible Officer reports. The policy creates a new avenue available to the discloser to address the concern in another way.

**9. Queen's University Planning**

**a) Oral update by Provost**

Senator Silverman reported that at its second meeting in December 2010, the committee discussed several sensitive issues, specifically the budget submissions from the faculties of Arts and Science and Engineering and Applied Science. At the next meeting, the QUPC will discuss the pension plan issue, and also hear from the Enrolment Planning Task Force.

**10. University Council on Athletics and Recreation (Appendix L, page 108)**

**a) Annual Report September 1, 2009 – August 31, 2010**

There were no questions or comments.

**IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES**

(Appendix M, page 122)

**1. Orientation Reports from Education, Law, Medicine and the School of Graduate Studies**

There were no questions or comments.

**V MOTIONS**

None Received

**VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE**

- 1. Board of Trustees Meeting, December 3/4, 2010** (Appendix N, page 128)
- 2. International Centre – Annual Report 2009-2010** (Appendix O, page 130 )
- 3. [Queen's University Annual Report 2009-2010](#)**
- 4. [Report on the Annual Budget 2010-2011](#)**
- 5. Research Report** (Appendix P, page 146)

**VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES** (Appendix Q, page 152)

- 1. Request for Formal Centre status for the Centre for Energy and Power Electronics Research (ePower) [Referred to Queen's University Planning Committee (QUPC)]**

**VIII OTHER BUSINESS**

None Received

**IX CLOSED SESSION**

Not Required

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

**INFORMAL SESSION**




**Review  
of the  
Functions of Senate**

Jean Stairs, Vice-Chair, Senate  
Chair, Senate Operations Review  
Committee  
January 20, 2011




**PROCESS FOR REVISING  
FUNCTIONS OF SENATE**



- In 2009, SORC began a review of Senate Composition.
- It concluded that the review should begin with an examination of the Functions of Senate, last amended Nov 1982
- At SORC's request, an informal session took place at Senate Sept 23 2010 to receive input on the 1982 Functions of Senate


**Process Continued**



At the September 2010 Informal Session, senators and attendees considered the following:

- What is the primary purpose of Senate?
- What are the vital functions of Senate that should be preserved?
- What should the Senate stop doing?
- What should the Senate consider doing to move forward?

**Process Continued**



- SORC used this input to develop a proposal revising the Functions of Senate
- At the Nov 2010 Senate meeting, SORC presented a notice of motion to consider a proposal revising the Functions of Senate
- In response to community feedback, consultation and further work by SORC in December and early January, additional revisions were incorporated

**Process Continued**




- Today, SORC recommends an informal session to discuss Revised Functions of Senate
- Revised Functions of Senate are presented in a tabular format comparing existing functions with proposed “revised functions” and adding the rationale for proposed changes

**Process Going Forward**



- SORC will consider input from informal session and present a final proposal for Functions of Senate, accompanied by a draft Committee Structure Map as a notice of motion on Feb 17, 2011
- SORC will consult with Senate Committees on a Committee structure that aligns with Functions of Senate
- March 24 2011, Senate will deliberate the motion
- SORC will then consider Senate composition required to fulfill Functions and Committee requirements

**Informal Session**



1. Should Senate have an overall purpose?
2. SORC proposes to remove the phrase “the well-being of students” and insert it in the purpose statement. SORC thinks it is too complex to identify as a function. What do you think?
3. Do the functions of Senate, as proposed, diminish the authority of Senate?
4. What general responses do you have to the proposed purpose and functions of Senate?