



Minutes

MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Monday, October 24, 2011 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

Present: D. Woolf (Chair), **Senators:** Adams, Bevan, Blennerhassett, Bowers, Brouwer, Burford-Grinnell, Campbell, Cheng, Cole, Colgan, Culham, Dickey Young, Dimitrakopoulos, Elliott, Fachinger, Flanagan, Foo, Harrison, Hart, Hird, Johnson, LaFleche, Lamoureux, MacKinnon, MacLean, Maurice, McIntire, D. Moore, Morelli, Oosthuizen, Parker, Remenda, Reznick, Shearer, Sienna, Walters, Wang, Whitehead, Woodhouse, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

Also Present: T. Alm, A. Aulhouse, C. Beach, D. Beauchemin, J-A. Brady, R. Coupland, C. Davis, H. Everson, R. Garcia, M. Heeler, E. LeBlanc, R. Lemieux, L. Long, G. Lessard, G. MacAllister, K. Julien-Michels, K. O'Brien, K. Owsik, I. Reeve, S. Rigden, K. Slobodin, H. Smith, C. Sumbler, S. Tanner, P. Taylor, S. Verbeek, K. Wallace, P. Watkin

I OPENING SESSION

The Chair welcomed senators to the October 24 meeting. A moment of silence was observed to honour the memory of third-year School of Computing student Allison Borges of Oakville, Ontario, who died October 9, 2011.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

Carried 11-61

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 27 September 2011 (Appendix A, page 1)

Senator McIntire noted an omission under II Question Period. She asked the Provost why the University could not carry a deficit during a global economic crisis when not carrying a deficit would severely damage the educational experience at Queen's. The details of her question will be added to the September 27, 2011 minutes.

Moved by Senator Culham, seconded by Senator MacLean, that the minutes of September 27, 2011 be adopted as amended.

Carried 11-62

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

None

4. Principal's Report

Student Mental Health

The Principal noted that he had been impressed with the students' energy and initiative on several fronts. Queen's Wears Green, a Commerce Society campaign to raise awareness of student mental health, is selling t-shirts, with proceeds going to The Jack Project and the Canadian Mental Health Association. The event culminates with a breakfast, performance by the student group Existere and a speakers' series at the Athletics and Recreation Centre. Eric Windeler, father of Jack, a first-year student who died of suicide in 2010, will give a talk on the issue. The Principal's Commission on Mental Health will meet with students, faculty and staff over the next few months and will hold open forums. Updates will be posted on the website at www.queensu.ca/cmh

Provincial Government Relations

The Principal has reached out to the new provincial Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Glenn Murray, former Minister of Research and Innovation, and will be meeting with him soon. The Principal plans to continue to engage with all political parties. He described the possible impact of a minority government on post-secondary funding in a context in which annual economic growth is forecasted to be between 1 and 1.5 per cent and where the government plans to limit health-care spending increases to 3 per cent a year, leaving little to no new funding for anything else.

The Principal observed that Queen's must continue to be strategic and careful with existing resources.

Federal Government Relations

The Principal is attending the 100th anniversary meeting of the AUCC in Montreal on October 25. The keynote speaker is alumnus and Governor General David Johnston. Undergraduate Trustee Lauren Long has been invited to participate in a program called "Conversations about Canada," discussing the benefits of universities and university research to Canada.

Academic Planning

The Principal described the extensive consultative process to date. It has been exhaustive and exhausting for the Academic Planning Task Force members over the last 10 months, but the process is crucial to the University's future success. He congratulated and thanked all who have contributed to the development of the Academic Plan. He encouraged senators to review the document carefully and talk about it with colleagues and peers before it comes before the Senate for approval on November 22. He reminded senators that the plan is a living document to be reviewed regularly, updated, changed and improved by Senate as it sees fit in conjunction with the individual faculty boards.

5. Provost's Report (Appendix B, page 10)

a) Report to Senate

In addition to his written report, the Provost drew attention to the October 24 financial update, the first of the academic year. It is posted on the Financial Update website at <http://www.queensu.ca/financialupdate/2011/oct2011.html>

There were no questions or comments on either the Principal's or the Provost's reports to Senate.

6. Other Reports requested by Senate

a) Council of Ontario Universities (COU) meeting, October 13-14, 2011

Senator Oosthuizen's written report is attached to the minutes.

Senator Oosthuizen, Academic Colleague, updated senators on the recent series of meetings held around the regular Council meeting. The David C. Smith Award, named in honour of the former Queen's Principal, was presented at the Oct. 13 dinner to Dr. Peter George, former President of McMaster University and former President of COU. The main topics discussed at the meetings included the:

- Ontario election and consequences of a minority government
- Operation of the Ontario Online Institute
- Quality Council activities – the Council has ratified all institutional Quality Assurance Processes (IQAPs) www.queensu.ca/provost/responsibilities/qualityassurance.html
- Extension of Academic Colleague appointment from two years to three years (renewable).

b) Board of Trustees meeting, September 23-24, 2011 (Appendix C, page 12)

There were no questions or comments.

II QUESTION PERIOD

None received

III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Academic Development (Appendix D, page 14)

a) Degree Name Changes in Queen's School of Business and the School of Graduate Studies

SCAD considered two degree name changes at its October 5 meeting that will benefit the programs in several ways. The changes, which are strongly supported by the students, will affect current and future students but not those who have already graduated.

Moved by Senator Cole, seconded by Senator Brouwer, that Senate approve the following degree name changes in Queen's School of Business and the School of Graduate Studies, effective immediately:

- 1. Master of Management — Global Management to Master of International Business**
- 2. Master of Management — Finance to Master of Finance.**

Carried 11-63

b) Establishment of the Hazell Research professorship in Chemical Design and Innovation in the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

Senator Cole noted that the inaugural professorship will be held by a current faculty member and that future competitions will target both internal and external applicants.

Moved by Senator Cole, seconded by Senator Woodhouse, that Senate approve the establishment of the Hazell Research Professorship in Chemical Design and Innovation, subject to ratification by the Board of Trustees.

Carried 11-64

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

a) **Senate Policy on Academic Integrity Procedures – Requirements of Faculties and Schools**

Moved by Senator Shearer, seconded by Senator Foo, that Senate approve the amendments to Section 4.4 of the Senate Policy on *Academic Integrity Procedures – Requirements of Faculties and Schools* as described in Appendix E, page 28.

Carried 11-65

In response to a question from Senator Morelli regarding the progression of appeals, Chair H. Everson stated the first appeal of an academic-integrity decision will always be a new hearing of the matter. Subsequent appeals will take the form of a review of the earlier decision and new evidence cannot be admitted at that stage. If the student raises new evidence, the appeal is referred back to the original decision-maker for reconsideration.

3. **Nominating (Appendix F, page 30)**

a) Elections

The Chair referred to the report in Appendix F, page 30.

Moved by Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator Wang, that Senate approve the election to the committees indicated of those named in the report in Appendix F, page 30.

Carried 11-66

D. Stewart and J. Parker abstained.

4. **Academic Planning Task Force (Appendix G, page 31)**

a) Notice of Motion

Moved by Senator LaFleche, on behalf of the Senate Agenda Committee, that formal Notice of Motion be given for Senate approval of the Queen's University Academic Plan, 2011, at the November 22, 2011 meeting of the Senate.

The Chair clarified that, according to *Bourinot's Rules of Order*, a Notice of Motion does not require a seconder and is not debatable.

b) Queen's University Academic Plan 2011

The Chair noted that, as described in the Notice of Motion and based on the forthcoming discussion, the Academic Planning Task Force may decide to make minor revisions to the Plan for clarification and amplification as well as correct any factual errors before the Plan comes before Senate on November 22.

Senator D. Moore requested that any motions related to the Academic Plan at the November 22 Senate meeting be conducted by secret ballot. Senator Morelli noted that *Bourinot's Rules of Order* (Section 43, page 55) gives provision for motions to be decided by secret ballot.

Moved by Senator D. Moore, seconded by Senator Morelli, that any motions pertaining to the Academic Plan at the November 22, 2011 meeting shall be conducted by secret ballot.

The motion was defeated (22-7).

Senator Morelli challenged the chair's ruling to allow discussion of item b) because it was not listed as a discussion item on the agenda, as it had been in previous agendas. In Senator Morelli's view, the Academic Plan was presented for review but should remain unchanged. To allow a discussion

on the Academic Plan as presented as a Notice of Motion would circumvent the rules. The Chair respectfully disagreed, and referred to the Functions of the Senate discussion during the 2010-2011 academic year as a precedent. Notice of Motion was provided and a series of discussions took place, after which the Senate Operations Review Committee made some changes to the document. He believed that it would be a waste of Senate's time not to have a discussion while the Task Force members were present and he anticipated that a list of any changes would be provided to Senate.

Senator Morelli challenged the Chair's ruling, saying that many senators may not be prepared for a discussion because the item was not listed as such.

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Adams to challenge the Chair's ruling to allow a discussion of the Queen's University Academic Plan 2011.

The motion was defeated (25-5).

In response to a question from Senator Morelli about Task Force membership, Secretary G. Moore referred to the footnote in Appendix G, page 32 about the departure of Task Force members M. Jones (sabbatical leave beginning July 1, 2011) and C. Rudnicki (continuing his studies at another institution). She clarified that K. Slobodin (AMS VP University Affairs, successor to former Task Force undergraduate member C. Rudnicki) has been sitting in on meetings as a resource on behalf of undergraduates because the Task Force felt strongly about the importance of including an undergraduate voice during its meetings over the summer and early fall.

The Chair invited the Task Force members present (Senators P. Fachinger, W. Flanagan and V. Remenda, former senator I. Reeve, staff representative S. Tanner and Chair P. Taylor) to introduce themselves.

S. Tanner read a short statement on behalf of the Task Force, drafted by the members. He described the work of the Task Force over nearly a year and its mandate to consult widely and transparently with the Queen's community, building on the work started by the Academic Writing Team's *Imagining the Future* and the unit responses to Principal D. Woolf's *Where Next?*

S. Tanner explained that the group had done its best to capture the vision, guiding principles and a set of ideas in a four-pillar framework, while providing flexibility for faculties and departments to meet the unique needs of their programs and constituents. From the outset, the Task Force recognized that strong consensus throughout the Queen's community would be needed for the plan to be embraced and successfully implemented. However, critical views expressed recently in the community regarding some aspects of the current draft plan have caused the Task Force to carefully review its contents. The Task Force does not feel that it has achieved the necessary consensus regarding support for blended learning and the role of undergraduate TAs. Therefore, it proposes to remove all references to these two elements from the plan. The goal has been to put forward ideas that are the result of consultations, research, deliberations and responses to feedback. Although members have held differing views on various issues, members have also been able to find a common ground of agreement.

Task Force member Senator P. Fachinger said that she had learned a great deal from her Task Force colleagues and particularly from the student members. Collaboration was challenging because members came from diverse backgrounds at the University and did not always "speak the same language." Members teach different subjects using different approaches. More collaboration across disciplines will help future generations to become more interdisciplinary. Although she saw her role on the Task Force as representing the humanities, the plan is for the whole university. Scientists, engineers and others need to see themselves in it. Ultimately, members wrote about issues that they were most comfortable with. One highlight was a meeting with members of Queen's Aboriginal community. She referred to the Aboriginal Council visioning document that she emailed to remind senators of the hard work and wisdom that went into the Council's process of envisioning its future.

The Chair invited questions.

Senator Morelli rose on a point of order. He stated that, if certain sections are to be deleted from the Queen's University Academic Plan 2011, the actual document will no longer be the same one presented to Senate in the Notice of Motion for approval in November. He suggested that the Notice of Motion was out of order. The Chair noted:

- The precedent of the SORC discussion of the Functions of Senate
- The purpose of a Notice of Motion, which is to refer to the matter to be deliberated; it does not necessitate that the document referred to in its full form be available.
- The fact that frequently, Notices of Motion are submitted for matters for which the document does not appear until the Agenda for the following meeting is published.

To give senators enough time to read the final document, it was agreed that the Task Force should complete final changes quickly and that it would be posted on the University Secretariat website as soon as possible.

Senator MacLean, Dean of Arts and Science, said that the latest document is a significant improvement over the earlier version brought to Senate. In his view, it is at a level that is appropriate for the entire University. He also noted that within the overall plan, faculties and departments will be doing their own detailed planning.

In response to a question from Senator McIntire on how policies on virtualization and blended learning would be decided if they are removed from the plan, I. Reeve responded that individual units would continue to adopt their own strategies as they do at present.

Chair P. Taylor addressed the question of what the University needs in an academic plan. He said that the Task Force listened to a lot of comments about problems in the university, indicating that many people were searching for ideas about how to solve problems. He pointed to the call for imagination described in Pillar 1: Fundamental Academic Skills. He echoed Senator Fachinger's comments about the huge diversity among academic units and spoke about his own increased respect for this diversity. He referred to the example of Professor A. Godlewska's blended learning project in the Department of Geography, which enables her to spend more time with her students one-on-one. He spoke about the Pillar 1 main objectives of writing, inquiry and critical thinking. He also said that Queen's needs to be reminded that its big strength is community. Queen's is home to an amazing set of scholars at different stages of scholarship. The challenge is to work together and the plan should provide the framework and ideas for this to happen. He believed that blended learning will be adopted by some, regardless of specific policies.

Senator Adams thanked the Task Force members for their hard work and noted that the faculty members on the committee did so while conducting their regular academic duties. She recommended strongly that a job of such importance should be recognized with appropriate release time. In her department of Kinesiology and Health Studies, faculty expertise spans the humanities to the physical sciences. However, she noted that this did not inhibit agreement on general principles or collaboration. In fact, she felt that her unit was a good example of high functioning collaboration.¹

Senator Remenda said that not everyone is going to see themselves in every piece of the plan, which contains recommendations about broad areas. Some departments may choose to pursue two or three things that speak particularly to them; others may not. Instructors use a variety of pedagogical approaches; the intention is not that everyone does everything that is written in the plan.

¹ Minutes amended to provide further details on Senator Adams' comments regarding the lack of course release time for faculty members on the Task Force.

I. Reeve said that the Academic Plan is the first stage of a continuous academic planning process for the University. What is laid out in the plan can and should be revisited in the future. After the amount of work that the Task Force and its predecessors have done over the past two years, it is very important to get something on the table to start the process.

Senator Morelli noted that the writing of the plan was a process of setting the vision for the University and that he hoped it would be ongoing. He requested clarifications regarding the guiding principles; whether the core activities were teaching and learning or learning and discovery.

He agreed with the statement that “Queen’s must consider all students, whether undergraduate, graduate or professional, first and foremost as students, putting their individual learning needs ahead of their potential contributions to the University as TAs, teachers or researchers.” He suggested that the phrase, “and as sources of revenue” be added.

Senator Morelli went on to ask if the academic plan is adopted, would the Task Force then propose a cyclical process for the future?

I. Reeve clarified that it would be up to Senate and not to the Task Force to determine how the academic planning process continues. The Task Force was directed to write the plan and not to develop the procedure for the future. However, members recommended strongly in the plan that such a procedure be implemented.

Senator Fachinger observed that much of the fear voiced through an online petition critical of the Academic Plan comes from concerns of how the plan might be implemented, which is not part of the Task Force’s mandate. While she felt that these fears may be understandable, it was also important to maintain the Senate’s value as a democratic forum to determine academic policy.

In answer to a question from Senator D. Moore about the difference between a “task-based” and an “inquiry-based” curriculum, Senator Remenda observed that for her the two terms were not different from one another. The Task Force used the “task-based” term in its meetings. However, it made sense to go back to “inquiry-based”, a term that was already more familiar at Queen’s and intended to help students to learn to think, write and disseminate critically.

The Chair thanked the Task Force for its participation and senators for their questions and comments.

5. Queen’s University Planning Committee

a) Oral report by the Provost

At its meeting on October 6, the QUPC reviewed budget parameters and guidelines for submissions of 2012-13 unit budgets and associated plans.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES

None received

V MOTIONS (Appendix H, page 86)

1. Reconsideration of the official grading system of Queen’s University – Submitted by Senator Morelli

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Adams, that Senate rescind Motion 09-42 and implement an official grading system that includes, at a minimum, both percentage grades and letter grades.

The motion was defeated (two abstentions).

Senator Morelli noted that Motion 09-42 was on the May 20, 2009 agenda. He cited several concerns:

- In his view, items substantive in nature such as a significant change to the grading scheme should be preceded by a Notice of Motion.
- The motion was presented at May meeting when most student senators were absent from campus.
- Although letter grades and Grade Point Average (GPA) are one and the same, problems arise with the numbers assigned to the GPA when computing cumulative averages. Conducted in a non-linear fashion, it disadvantages a number of students. In his department, Physics, Engineering Physics and Astronomy, normally half of the 60 students enrolled in fourth year Engineering Physics have averages of 80 per cent or higher. Since the change to the grading system, however, 30 per cent or 18 to 20 students no longer make the Dean's list and will not graduate with first-class honours. Consequently, the system will adversely affect their ability to obtain scholarships and to be accepted into graduate studies.

A strategy is needed to remediate the negative effect of the grading system on students. Senator Morelli clarified that his motion asked that all information be retained, including the linear scaling system contained within the percentage grading scheme. This can be done within a GPA system by scaling percentage equivalents between zero and 4.3.

Senator Harrison acknowledged that discussion on the item had been generously postponed to give him time to acquaint himself with details. Former SCAP Chair C. Beach and University Registrar J. Brady, who were both involved in the process, were present to contribute to the discussion.

Senator Harrison recounted that in the fall of 2008 an analysis was conducted which showed that a majority of North American universities use a grading scheme based on a credit unit-weighting pattern and letter grades combined with a GPA. SCAP engaged in considerable discussion throughout the University community, including faculty boards, the student Senate caucus and the Graduate School Executive Council. This led to a motion approved by SCAP on April 23, 2009.

Senator Harrison noted that the student information system is one part of the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system. The motion seems to suggest that the reason for the change is to accommodate the ERP, when it is in fact to bring Queen's in line with other universities in North America and with Europe as a consequence of the Bologna process, to ensure that Queen's students are not disadvantaged when competing for graduate places in Europe. The 4.0 system originally proposed is the most common grading system. The modified scale of 4.3 approved by Senate in April 2010 that Queen's now follows is the second-most common standard. It has been suggested that the University could accommodate more than one official grade on the transcript. He noted that, although cost should not be used as an argument for rejecting the motion, customization of the ERP architecture involves significant costs; not just once but every time the system is updated. Ultimately, it should be rejected because the notion that this decision took place in secret is incorrect, when the process was widely consultative.

C. Beach expressed dismay about having to revisit the issue when 18 months of programming and planning have occurred since the decision was made on the new grading rules. The motion preamble presumes that little consultation or research went into the May 20, 2009 decision to shift from a numerical to a letter-based GPA system and that SCAP tried to slip a motion through when not all senators were present. This could not be further from the truth. Very extensive consultation took place in the Queen's community and extensive research was done on the practices of other institutions in Canada, the US, UK, Europe and China. The reason the vote took place in May 2009 was to allow for further research in response to requests from faculty and students and to address several concerns that had been raised.

C. Beach noted that he had outlined the lengthy consultation process by SCAP and the University Registrar's office to the Senate leading up to May 20, 2009. The motion of May 20, 2009 was widely known, particularly by the students because a number of students were members of the committee.

Extensive efforts were made to inform them. C. Beach and the University Registrar spoke to students at Queen's residences. C. Beach met at least three times with students in the School of Business.

The motion preamble conflates the need to change from the former non-standard and unsustainable numerical grading system with implementation issues related to transition to a new style of grading system. Long-term fundamental needs should not be confused with transition costs and temporary problems.

The penultimate claim in the preamble, that "it seems reasonable to expect that any data management system, especially one that costs over \$30 million, should be able to handle both percentage grades and letter grades /GPAs if so required" is incorrect. The motion is economically unfeasible. C. Beach reported that, early on, SCAP inquired whether the new system could handle letter and numerical grades. SCAP met with programmers familiar with the PeopleSoft system to see whether this was feasible. They learned that tailoring the PeopleSoft system would be very costly – a "six-digit" problem, mainly because the PeopleSoft system is structured to handle one official grade. This cost would be a recurring expense with each software update. It was felt that the University could not afford this additional cost. This information was conveyed at the May 20, 2009 Senate meeting and also at the April 2010 Senate meeting where the new grading scale was unanimously adopted. C. Beach suggested that the new system be tried out for five years in order to determine refinements or changes.

J. Brady noted that since May 2010 all faculties and schools have worked on updating academic regulations and procedures to comply with the new system. The Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science is looking at students at the lower end – those on probation – so that students are not caught in a change of system. Similarly, the faculty plans to do the same for those at the top end regarding honours lists, and are determining what transition accommodation may be appropriate.

Senator Campbell said that she would not vote in favour of the motion but that she agreed with many of the points raised by Senator Morelli. Several students were absent from the May 2009 meeting and were upset that the May timing prevented their attendance. The University Registrar did a fantastic job of consulting, but a lot of facts were changing as the process evolved. The information changed from the early consultations to after the vote. She said she was unsure that the concerns of all students have been adequately addressed. Her own average has fallen. Grandfathering to accommodate students on the cusp does not seem to have happened.

2. Reconsideration of Deputy Provost membership on Senate

-Submitted and withdrawn by Senator Morelli

The Chair called on Senator Morelli to introduce the motion.

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Adams, that Senate reconsider the Motion "It is moved by the Senate Operations Review Committee that 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."

Senator Morelli reported that, in advance of the Senate meeting, he had spoken with Senate Secretary G. Moore about the above motion and the motion he submitted under **3. Senate composition and the Guiding Principle**. At that time, it was agreed that Senator Culham, Chair of SORC would be invited to speak to the motion.

Senator Culham observed that Senate composition, prior to the decision to include the Deputy Provost as a member of Senate, was not in keeping with the guiding principle; being that elected faculty senators never drop below 54 per cent, and that ex-officio members never exceed 19 per cent.

SORC is aware of this imbalance and is working to resolve it. It is one of the reasons why it was asked to review the composition of Senate; the second being to attempt to reduce the size of Senate. When

SORC began work on this task more than a year ago, it realized that it needed to look at the functions of Senate first. After extensive review and discussion, Senate approved the revised Functions of the Senate on April 28, 2011. This year, SORC is examining the committees of Senate in view of the revised functions and the composition of the Senate.

This is why SORC included the proviso on the Deputy Provost appointment; that it is an interim appointment until the SORC has completed its review of Senate composition and that Senate had ratified it. SORC has agreed to put an end date on the Deputy Provost appointment of May 31, 2012 in case it does not complete its review on Senate composition before the end of the academic year.

The Chair expressed regret for unintentionally misspeaking at the September 27 Senate meeting about the composition of Senate. Membership categories are ex-officio and elected faculty, staff and students. In this case, Senator Morelli is correct in pointing out that there is a difference between elected and ex-officio members.

Senator Morelli noted that he was satisfied with the May 31 deadline offered by Senator Culham. He clarified that there was never any objection to the Deputy Provost S. Cole serving on Senate; the concern lay with adding more ex-officio members to Senate.

Given the responses of Senator Culham and the Chair, Senator Morelli withdrew Motion 2 and Motion 3, with the understanding that SORC will come back to Senate later in the academic year with recommendations on the composition of Senate for discussion and that it will bring to an end the interim nature of the Deputy Provost position on Senate. Senator Adams consented to the motions being withdrawn.

3. Senate composition and the Guiding Principle

-Submitted and withdrawn by Senator Morelli

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Adams, that the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC) prepare for the November 2011 Senate meeting a proposal for approval by Senate recommending modifications to the current Composition of Senate such that the Composition of Senate be made consistent with Senate's "guiding principle" of "proportionate composition as directed by Senate in 1996," with the following proportions: that

- Faculty members NEVER be less than 54%;
- Ex-officio members NEVER be more than 19%;
- Student members NEVER be less than 23%
- Staff members NEVER be less than 4%

4. Motions pertaining to the Academic Planning Task Force

-Submitted by Senator Morelli

Senator Morelli drew attention to the Notice of Motion pertaining to the Academic Planning Task Force in [Appendix H, page 91](#).

VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE

(Appendix I, page 94)

1. Research Report

Senator MacLean noted a correction in Appendix I, page 95. Jean Côté is Director of the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies and not a member of the Faculty of Education.

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES

(Appendix J, page 98)

1. Five-Year Review of the Queen's Cancer Research Institute [referred to the Senate Advisory Research Committee (SARC) and the Queen's University Planning Committee (QUPC)]

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

None received

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Council of Ontario Universities (COU)

Council Meeting and Other Related Meetings

Held on Thursday October 13 and Friday October 14, 2011

ACADEMIC COLLEAGUE'S REPORT TO SENATE

As usual the overall meeting involved Executive Heads' meetings, two Academic Colleagues Meetings, and the Council Meeting. The annual dinner at which the David C. Smith Award is presented was also held on the Thursday evening. The award, which is named after the former Queen's University principal, is presented annually to an individual for significant contributions to scholarship and policy on higher education in Canada. This year's recipient was Dr. Peter George, former President of McMaster University and former President of COU.

Among the main topics discussed at the meetings were:

Ontario Election and Its Consequences: The changes in the political landscape in Ontario that could result from having a minority government were discussed. Some discussion also took place about the potential impact on the universities of the possible financial difficulties that could be experienced by the Ontario government. The government's previously announced plan to provide tuition grants to students from families with incomes of less than \$160,000 was also discussed. There remain many unanswered questions about this plan and about the role of the Ontario universities in its implementation.

Ontario Online Institute (OOI): The Ministry had earlier announced that the On-Line Institute (OOI) would not be a degree granting body and would not develop its own on-line courses, its aim being to make information about on-line courses in Ontario available to all and to coordinate activity in Ontario in the field. Membership of the institute would be voluntary. It was subsequently decided that OOI would be operated by Contact North and would be managed by the person who had been the special advisor to the Minister on the OOI. The structure decided on was not that recommended by COU and a great deal of dissatisfaction about the proposed structure of OOI and about the way in which the decision about its structure had been arrived at was expressed. COU will recommend to the ministry that its decision regarding OOI be revisited.

Credit Transfer: Members of the Ontario Committee of Academic Vice-Presidents (Principals) – OCAV – are working with COU's Credit Transfer Resource Group to develop policy options to support the government's implementation of improved credit transfer processes in Ontario. COU is working to support the establishment of the new coordinating body, the Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer (ONCAT). ONCAT's mandate is basically to provide information to students on transfers, to develop pathway projects, and to provide information on transfers to the

government. Universities will have to decide whether or not they will become members of ONCAT. Most universities apparently intend to join. The COU secretariat is also developing policy directions regarding university-to-university credit transfer. The subject of credit transfers between colleges and universities and between different universities continues to be a topic of importance to the government.

Quality Council: An update on the activities of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance was provided. The Quality Council has now ratified all university IQAPs. The Council has also reviewed two revised university IQAPs submitted for ratification. The Council has also approved the first new program proposal under the Quality Assurance Framework. As mandated under the OCAV transition document, the Quality Council is receiving reports from OCGS periodic appraisals where the status was “Good Quality with Report” or “Conditionally Approved”. Five such OCGS reports have thus far been reviewed.

Academic Colleagues Discussion Papers: After quite extensive discussions of draft versions among the colleagues, the Colleagues Discussion Paper on Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness: Considerations for Ontario Universities was submitted to the Council. The discussion of the paper at the Council meeting was generally favorable. This paper will be made available to all Senate members. The Colleagues have also recently introduced Mini Discussion Papers whose purpose is to quite briefly introduce topics about which there are widely differing views in the academic community. The first of these on What is a University was also presented to Council. Extensive discussion of this mini paper took place, strong views in favour of and against various aspects of the paper being expressed.

Term of Appointment of Academic Colleagues: The COU constitution had specified that the term of an Academic Colleague’s appointment was normally two years. However it had long been felt by most of the Colleagues that this term was too short and did not give colleagues a long enough time to familiarize themselves with the operation of COU and with the role of the Academic Colleagues, that it did not allow enough time for Colleagues to put their names forward to serve on COU committees, working groups and task forces, and did not allow Colleagues enough time to become adequately informed about the committees they served on and thus not enough time to become productive members of the committees. For these reasons the colleagues moved that the COU constitution be amended to state that the term of an Academic Colleague would normally be three years (renewable). This was approved by the Council. In future therefore, unless there are special circumstances, Academic Colleagues should be appointed for three years renewable.

Patrick H. Oosthuizen
Queen’s University Academic Colleague

October 21, 2011