



## Minutes

---

### MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Tuesday April 17, 2012 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

---

**Present:** D. Woolf (Chair) **Senators:** Abdollah, Adams, Basser, Beach, Blennerhassett, Bridges, Brouwer, Campbell, Chapman, Cheng, Cole, Colgan, Crowell, Culham, De Souza, Dickey Young, Dimitrakopoulos, Dimitrov, Fachinger, Flanagan, Harrison, Johnson, Jones, LaFleche, Liss, MacKinnon, MacLean, Maurice, McCormack, Medves, Morelli, Oleschuk, Oosthuizen, Parker, Reid, Scribner, Shearer, Sullivan, Tierney, Whitehead, Woodhouse, Young, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

**By teleconference:** R. Reznick

**Also present:** T. Alm, V. Ashford, K. Banting, J. Brady, B. Brousseau, R. Coupland, M. Dineen, S. Dunn, J. Fisher, N. Francis, J. Holmes, R. Lemieux, G. Lessard, G. MacAllister, R. Marchildon, W. Mabee, D. McDowall, K. O'Brien, L. Peterson, L. Ploeg, S. Rigden, H. Smith, J. Schmelzle, C. Sumbler, E. VanDenKerkhof, S. Verbeek, K. Wallace, B. Wandschneider, P. Watkin

## I OPENING SESSION

The Chair welcomed senators to the April meeting. He introduced SGPS President M. Scribner, who is a new ex-officio member as of April 1. He acknowledged AMS President M. Campbell, who was attending her last Senate meeting. He noted this was also the last Senate meeting for the Principal and faculty and student Senate members from the School of Religion, the former Queen's Theological College, which will merge with the University on May 1, 2012. On behalf of Senate, he thanked Senators Dickey-Young, Basser and MacKinnon and wished them well.

### 1. Adoption of Agenda

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

**Carried 12-25**

### 2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 28 February and 27 March, 2012 (Appendix A, page 1)

**Moved by Senator Brouwer, seconded by Senator Culham, that the minutes of 28 February, 2012, be adopted as circulated.**

**Carried 12-26**

**Moved by Senator Medves, seconded by Senator Cole, that the minutes of 27 March, 2012 be adopted as circulated.**

**Carried 12-27**

Senator Jones drew attention to a series of proposed revisions to page 4 of the March 27 minutes Section III, Reports of Committees, 1 a) Academic Development. A copy of the requested revisions was distributed to senators at the meeting.

Moved by Senator Jones, seconded by Senator Morelli, that the March 27, 2012 minutes be amended to include revisions as proposed by Senator Jones.  
The motion was defeated.

Senator Campbell reported that student Senate caucus agreed that a summary of Senate actions was preferable. However, they also saw the benefit of being able to refer to specific comments made by senators, noting that the level of specificity should be consistent for all senators, and talked about the possibility of recorded meetings.

The Chair asked that the matter be referred to the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC).

Senator Morelli requested that the minutes be available within a week of a Senate meeting taking place. In his view, it would help senators wishing to follow up on particular issues if the draft minutes of the previous meeting were available well in advance of the next.

The Chair agreed that it is preferable to have ample time to read the minutes. However, he observed that there are operational constraints, noting that the Secretariat operates on minimal resources and provides administrative support to the Board and Board committees as well the Senate and a number of Senate committees.

### **3. Business Arising from the Minutes**

Senator Jones made three comments concerning the Principal's announcement on April 17 that Justice Frank Iacobucci had agreed to take on the task of advising Senate on its academic authority, in keeping with the Senate Motion of February 28.

- (1) In an email dated March 30, the Principal clarified that Justice Iacobucci "has been retained by the Board of Trustees, not the Senate." Senator Jones said that in his view this did not seem to be in keeping with the terms of the Senate motion requesting that "Senate obtain independent legal advice from a law firm with experience dealing with public law issues." Senator Jones believed that the question being investigated had to do with a contest of authorities between the Board of Trustees and Senate, and it seemed inappropriate that Senate should be "obtaining independent legal advice" retained by the party with whose authority it is contending.
- (2) The minutes record that the Principal has provided Justice Iacobucci with "Details on the circumstances leading to the suspension of first-year admissions to the BFA program in 2011 and of small concentrations in the Faculty of Arts and Science in 2009." Because the Senate Motion asked for advice on more abstractly phrased questions, Senator Jones questioned whether this information about events of 2009 and 2011 could be considered pertinent. Further, he contended that if information were presented to the Justice by the administration, it would surely be presented to him from an administrative point of view. Therefore, he asked that the Principal share with Senate the exact information as it was presented to the Justice, and that he give Senate an opportunity to present the same information to the Justice from a Senate point of view.
- (3) Senator Jones requested that the minutes record that Justice Iacobucci was given "the pertinent writings on these issues by... Diane Kelly," as well as the Principal's refusal to share these writings with Senate itself. Senator Jones reiterated his wish to state for the record that in his opinion this refusal was inappropriate.

The Chair noted that when the original motion about Senate authority on academic decisions came before Senate at the February 28 meeting, he had answered the question as to why Ms. Kelly's opinion, written for him at his request and sent to the Justice, would not be disclosed and that he would not revisit it. He reminded senators that Senate has no ability to retain legal advice or expend

the resources to do so, and that he had hired a legal counsel at Senate's request, but as an agent of the Board.

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

##### Government funding and Queen's values

The current federal and provincial government relations situation requires that the University know its values and tell its story.

- Funding will likely remain lower than the rate of inflation and the University will need to be clear on what it needs and why
- The level of oversight is intensifying; Queen's must show how it adds value by the governments' measures and how it adds value in ways not currently measured.

Some values are shared by most or all at the University:

- the value of Queen's residential environment
- Queen's as a balanced academy
- the importance of service as key to Queen's values
- the centrality of basic skills in
  - thinking: critical thinking at one end, imaginative at the other
  - writing: clear at one end, imaginative at the other

Other values are still under discussion. The Principal referred to a document he will release in the coming weeks in which he argues that the University faces a major inflection point and that it needs to think seriously about:

- Queen's global presence (we are still not where we need to be)
- The role of social media and information technology, not for itself, but for how it affects teaching and learning at Queen's
- The nature of the learning environment - how to use the residential campus as a teaching tool; how to use students to help students learn – e.g. Psych 100, Medicine

Part of the Principal's job is to represent these to government and elsewhere, but everyone must tell the Queen's story in many ways and venues. It is important to speak more loudly about Queen's accomplishments than its problems. Challenges such as faculty renewal exist and must be faced; however examples of imagination and innovation should be celebrated and emulated.

#### 5. **Provost's Report** (Appendix C, page 20)

The Provost thanked those who attended the Budget Presentation immediately preceding the Senate meeting.

He went on to address some questions that had been posed at the March 27 Senate meeting.

##### Budget

The balancing of the 2011-2012 University budget will be achieved in part by addressing some short-term continuing commitments with one-time funding. About \$2 million was realized as a result of savings.

##### The GPA and the Deans' Honour Lists

The Provost expanded further on Grade Point Averages and consistency across Faculty Deans' lists. According to the SCAP report in the February 28 Senate agenda (page 110), the total number of students on the Dean's list with a cumulative Grade Point Average of 3.5 was comparable to that of previous academic years. This suggests that the threshold of 3.5 is equivalent to 80 per cent. The adjustment to 3.5 is intended to leave roughly unchanged the proportion of students who make the Dean's honour list. Since the February 28 meeting, the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

had approved 3.5 as the cut-off for its Dean's Honour List and it is anticipated that the School of Business will also adopt 3.5 as its cut-off, in order to achieve consistency across the University.

#### Grade Point Average

The Provost noted that he and others had originally misunderstood the concerns of Senator Parker, Education Student Senator. Currently, students' grades in the B.Ed. degree are conflated with those of the student's Queen's baccalaureate degree for the purposes of calculating the GPA. The issue was created when the Faculty of Education went to a modified GPA of 1 through 4. Had it stayed with a Pass-Fail, this would not have occurred. This is not the fault of the Faculty. The Provost noted that this issue also arises with students in the MD and LLD programs where the student has a baccalaureate degree from Queen's. The faculties have devised workarounds; however, three workarounds for three different faculties should not be necessary.

The following issues are complicated and will need further examination:

- Whether individual percentage grades can be included on the transcript
- The conflation of grades in calculating the cumulative GPA across multiple degrees.

The Provost referred to information he asked Senator Brouwer, Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, to provide. With the exception of the University of Toronto, which includes percentage grades on the transcript, all Ontario universities use a cumulative Grade Point Average. The additional information provided by the Queen's 4.3 GPA maximum was deemed useful, because difference between 4 and 4.3 is difference between an A and A plus.

The Provost observed that including percentage grades on transcripts is complex and the analysis to determine the overall cost would take some time. The University's Chief Information Officer, Bo Wandschneider, has a process in place to do this. The Provost noted that any ERP involves modifications from time to time. Any resulting change cannot be implemented until the fall. The Provost said that he would report back to Senate as soon as possible on the options, taking into consideration the costs and benefits.

The Provost drew attention to:

- The Queen's three-minute thesis competition for masters (thesis only) and doctoral students. Developed at the University of Queensland, Queen's is the first Ontario university to host a competition
- Council of Ontario Universities (COU) - Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) symposium on learning outcomes, featuring a keynote address by George Kuh of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

#### a) Tuition Fee Report

The Provost referred to the Tuition Fee Report, provided to the Senate for information and for approval at the May 4 Board of Trustees meeting. He noted that the report was later than normal, due to the late announcement by the provincial government on the tuition framework. The one-year framework announced by the province makes long-term budgeting difficult. He noted that international tuition rates were the same as domestic figures.

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

None

## II QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Morelli questioned why a subcommittee struck by the Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD) to create a policy document on a formal procedure for the suspension of academic program and/or suspension of admissions to academic programs conducted its meetings in closed session and why the Queen's University Faculty Association Observer on SCAD was not allowed to attend these meetings.

Senator Cole, Chair of SCAD, noted that it was her experience and that of others that Senate Committees often strike small subcommittees to do the initial legwork in order to bring issues and/or draft documents back to the main Senate Committee more expediently. She also noted that others had asked to attend subcommittee meetings in an Observer capacity but had also been denied. In answer to a question by Senator Morelli, Senator Cole noted that Associate Dean of Arts and Science H. Horton was invited to participate on the subcommittee because of his detailed knowledge of the issues in Queen's most complex Faculty (Arts and Science). She assured Senator Morelli that the process was transparent because when the subcommittee finishes its work, SCAD would have the opportunity to discuss the matter in full at its regular meeting. All members, guests and observers present there would have the opportunity to make comments and recommend revisions to the documents before the elected SCAD membership is asked to vote on it and make a recommendation to Senate.

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Jones that the SCAD subcommittee be dissolved.  
The motion was defeated. (7 in favour, 34 opposed, 4 abstentions)

In response to Senator Jones suggestion that subterfuge had taken place, the Chair noted that the use of such a word on the floor of Senate was disturbing and not consistent with the collegial conduct in this body. He advised senators to argue and debate but to be respectful and not assume a maligned motive about positions on which they might disagree.

Senator Chapman noted that the motion passed in January to ask SCAD to do the work had an original deadline of April for a report and asked for an updated deadline. Senator Cole noted the complexity of the task as well as the difficulty to accommodate people's schedules for meetings. An update is expected to come to the May 22 Senate meeting.

## III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. **Academic Development** (Appendix D, page 28)
  - a) Enrolment Plan 2012-2013

**Moved by Senator Cole, seconded by Senator Woodhouse, that Senate approve the Enrolment Plan for 2012-2013 and that Senate empower the University Registrar to make any adjustments as are necessary and appropriate to specific program goals and opportunities to ensure that the total projected enrolment for 2012-2013 is achieved.**

**Carried 12-28**

The following points were discussed:

- Modest growth is envisaged on the conventional model
- The current enrolment plan, unlike plans for previous years, does not mention infrastructure limitations and recommends online distance education.
- Whether the role of long-term planning of student support services such as emergency services and mental health support were considered in arriving at the final numbers
- The Strategic Enrolment Management Committee continues to meet to develop a longer term plan.

Senator Oosthuizen observed that the Quality Council Appraisal Committee praised two new Senate-approved graduate programs: the Graduate Education Certificate in Community Relations for the Extractive Industries and a Master of Science in Healthcare Quality. Senator Oosthuizen noted that credit should go to the authors of both programs and to the School of Graduate Studies for their hard work.

**2. Advisory Research** (Appendix E, page 34)

a) Cancer Research Institute five-year review

**Moved by S. Liss, seconded by B. Brouwer, that Senate approve the renewal of the Cancer Research Institute for an additional period of five years, effective December 8, 2011, subject to ratification by the Board of Trustees.**

**Carried 12-29**

b) Strategic Research Plan update

**Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Culham, that the Strategic Research Plan Update be considered in an informal session chaired by the Principal.**

**Carried 12-30**

Senator Liss, VP (Research) described the consultation process. The process for reviewing and renewing the Strategic Research Plan began well before 2011. He noted that SARC approved the Plan at its meeting on April 16 and extended his thanks to the Research Community Committee as well as the heads of humanities departments who facilitated discussion about the plan, noting that a greater focus has been put on the needs of these departments in order to reflect fully the aspirations of the University. Senator Liss focused on the key areas of the plan and then invited questions.

*The power point presentation is attached to the minutes.*

The following points were discussed:

- Focus on research excellence; recruitment strategies to ensure breadth require hiring the best people and supporting junior colleagues to succeed
- Queen's research accomplishments are reflected across the spectrum beyond those of its Canada Research Chairs
- Increased difficulty in securing NSERC grants
- Initiatives are necessary to support research conducted by graduate students; this research should also be acknowledged
- Plan metrics will be developed to assess progress and make choices based on progress.

Senator Liss invited senators to comment on the plan before it comes to the Senate on May 22 for final approval.

**Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Morelli, that the informal session now rise.**

**Carried 12-31**

**3. Queen's University Planning Committee**

a) Oral report by the Provost

The Provost reported that main topics discussed included integrated planning and the news that early indications were for a balanced budget for 2102-13. The QUPC will reconvene in the fall.

Senator Morelli requested that the Provost give an update on Non-Academic Discipline at the next Senate meeting. He was asked to email his request to the Secretariat for referral to the Senate Agenda Committee.

#### **IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES**

##### **1. School of Religion** (Appendix F, page 58)

The Principal noted that unfortunately Senator Dickey Young, Principal of the School of Religion, had to leave the meeting and was unable to present her report – the final report from Queen’s only affiliated college before its merger with the University on May 1, 2012. He noted that exactly 100 years to the day, on May 1, 1912 the College had split with the University. He invited senators to the celebration of the merger to take place on May 1, from 3:30 to 5 p.m. in the Fireside Room in Ban Righ Hall.

#### **V MOTIONS**

##### **1. Queen’s University Strategic Research Plan** (Appendix G, page 60)

The Chair drew attention to a Notice of Motion for the Queen’s University Strategic Research Plan to come before the Senate on May 22, 2012.

#### **VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE**

The Chair drew attention to the following reports provided to the Senate for information.

##### **1. New Senators 2012** (Appendix H, page 61)

The Chair noted that a revised report was posted on the Secretariat website that included the recent results of elections by the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science.

- 2. Sustainable Bioeconomy Centre (SBC)** (Appendix I, page 62)
- 3. Research Report** (Appendix J, page 63)

#### **VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES** (Appendix K, page 67)

- 1. Five-year review of the Centre for Health Services and Policy Research** [Referred to the Senate Advisory Research Committee (SARC)]
- 2. Proposal for a new Graduate Field of studies in Art History and Art Conservation in the PhD Program in Art History** [Referred to Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD)]

#### **VIII OTHER BUSINESS**

Senator Morelli requested that an informal session be scheduled to discuss Senate Function 2. “Senate will participate in strategic planning for the University, including but not limited to the budgetary process and campus planning and development”. Senator Morelli was asked to email his request to the Secretariat..

**IX CLOSED SESSION**

Not required.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.



## Strategic Research Plan 2012-2017



*Evolving in a shifting landscape: finding our balance...*

**Prof. Steven N. Liss, Vice-Principal Research**  
Presentation to Senate & Notice of Motion to Approve the SRP 2012-17



## Consultation & Milestones

- Approval of process **completed**
- Research Community Committee selection **completed**
- Collecting ideas **completed**
- Broad community consultation/Town Halls **completed**
- RCC Meetings **completed**
- Drafting of Strategic Plan **completed**
- Review by Faculties **completed**
- Queen's Planning Committee (for consultation & information)
- Posting and dissemination of draft for feedback **completed**
- Penultimate draft **completed**
- Approvals: SARC **completed** and Senate (April/May 2012)

*\*Notice of Motion; Final approval at May Senate Meeting*

## Research Community Committee

<b>Faculty</b> John Fisher Elizabeth VanDenKerkhof Derek Berg John Kirby James McLellan Ugo Piomelli Kurt Kyser Francois Rouget Darryl Robinson Susan Brodt	<b>Centres</b> Ian Moore Jonathan Crush Michael Green Warren Mabee	<b>Research Chairs</b> David Murakami Wood Jean-Michel Nunzi Ingrid Johnsrude Keith Banting
<b>Staff</b> Leone Ploeg Barbra Brousseau	<b>Undergraduate Representative</b> Mira Dineen	<b>Library</b> Sharon Murphy
	<b>Graduate Student (PhD)</b> Mary Georgina Chaktsiris	<b>OVPR</b> Susan Marlin Sonja Verbeek Jason Schmelzle
	<b>Post-Doctoral Representative</b> Dominic Standage	

*Acknowledgements*

## Strategic Research Plan

- In an increasingly complex research environment, it is important to:
  - know where Queen's can put a stake in the ground today and in the future
  - be responsive to the challenges of a changing research and innovation landscape
  - increase our ability to advance strengths and develop strategies for emerging areas
  - create and respond to new opportunities

## Strategic Research Plan

- **Mandatory**
  - For participation in:
    - Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)
    - CRC program
  - Relevance
    - Last reviewed in 2006 based on a plan established in 2003
- **Aspirational**
  - How can we advance our strengths?
  - Where will we be in five years (or where do we want to be in five years), and how do we get there?
- **Integrated Planning**
  - Academic Planning
  - Supporting strategic directions

## Finding Our Balance


- Research intensity, excellence and reputation while maintaining size and scale of our university enterprise
- Graduate growth and excellence of undergraduate programs
- Foundational research and advancing innovation & partnerships
- Advancing contributions to large initiatives, increasing focus on health-related research, and supporting and enhancing the social sciences, arts and humanities
- Growing our international presence and research reputation while supporting local socioeconomic growth

### Landscape is Changing

- Tri-Councils
- Increasing focus on collaborative, interdisciplinary research
- Federal and Provincial Budgets
- Industry Partnerships
- Innovation & Knowledge Mobilization
- International Engagement
  - Brain circulation, collaboration, resource access

### Part 1:

## Guiding and supporting the research enterprise



### Framework for Planning

- The plan will be reviewed biennially to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of the Queen's research community, as well as addresses new priorities that may evolve and be supported by traditional and non-traditional sources of research funding.
- This is an institutional plan, which is informed by Faculty and Departmental/School plans. It does not replace, nor does it diminish, the value or importance of the unit plans.
- We will continue to use the Canada Research Chairs (CRC), the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Ministry of Economic Development and Innovation programs to enhance areas of research strength and ensure that we have the critical mass of researchers and the associated infrastructure in strategic areas.
- The Plan is guided by a set of principles focused on research excellence, supporting the academic mission, innovation, integrated planning, compliance and accountability, and communication.

### Objectives

1. Enhance internationally recognized research programs
2. Provide transformative experiences for undergraduates, graduate students and post-doctoral trainees
3. Promote and enhance opportunities for collaborative and interdisciplinary initiatives
4. Promote and enhance research partnerships
5. Advance diversity and inclusivity through research
6. Encourage and support the translation and transfer of research outcomes, new knowledge and innovation for the betterment of society.




### Summary and Key Recommendations

1. Measuring our progress and success
2. Processes and mechanisms to enhance research
3. Innovation
4. Collaboration and interdisciplinarity
5. Global engagement and internationalization
6. Research leadership and excellence

### Part 2:

## Thematic Focus



### Queen's Research Mission

- Queen's upholds the commitment to the breadth and depth of the research enterprise, and recognizes the underlying value of ongoing support of individual scholarship, and by recognizing the important contributions to research excellence that continue to be made in this way.

### Investment in Research Excellence

- Research Leadership
- Graduate Programs & Post-Doctoral Training
- Centres and Institutes
- Infrastructure
- *Research Themes, Clusters and Signature Programs*

### Thematic Focus

- *Exploring Human Dimensions*
  - Exploring Society, Culture, and Human Behaviour
  - Enhancing Human Health
- *Understanding and Sustaining the Environment & Energy Systems*
  - Human Aspects of Health Environments
  - Ecology and the Natural Environment
  - Energy Conversion Systems
  - Energy and Environmental Policy
- *Creating, Discovering and Innovating*
  - Creative Production and Expression
  - Physical and Natural World
  - Materials
  - Advanced Technologies
- *Securing Safe and Successful Societies*
  - Democracy, Economy, and Public Policy
  - Information and Communications
  - Infrastructure

### Questions, Comments & Discussion