



Minutes

MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Thursday, February 17, 2011 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

Present: Senator Stairs in the Chair. **Senators:** Abdelmahmoud, Abdollah, Bevan, Blennerhassett, Boag, Bowers, Brouwer, Chaudhry, A. Chowdhury, S. Chowdhury, Christie, Colgan, Colwell, Cordy, Crowell, Culham, De Souza, Dimitrov, Farewell, Fisher, Fulford, Goodspeed, Jones, Kim, Kwong, LaFleche, Lockhart, MacDougall, MacLean, Medves, Morelli, Oosthuizen, Pierce, Qureshy, Reeve, Reid, Ryan, Silverman, Sinkinson, Summers, Tolmie, Wang, Whitehead, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

Also Present: J-A. Brady, M. Campbell, S. Cole, C. Davis, N. Day, J. Druery, B. Foo, B. Griffith, M. Heeler, P. Jain, B. King, L. Long, G. MacAllister, S. Murphy, L. Peterson, C. Rudnicki, H. Smith, C. Sumbler, S. Tanner, P. Taylor, S. Verbeek, K. Wallace, P. Watkin, S. Wilcox, P. Young

Senate observed a moment of silence in memory of upper-year student Robert Nason, who died February 15, 2011.

I OPENING SESSION

1. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Oosthuizen, that Senate adopt the agenda as circulated with the addition of an oral report from the Chair of the Queen's University Planning Committee as item 7a) under Reports of Committees.

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Crowell, that questions he prepared in writing for the Chair be added to the Senate Agenda for the February 2011 Senate meeting during the Question Period.

The motion was approved as amended.

Carried 11-13

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 20 January 2011 (Appendix A, page 1)

Moved by Senator Fisher, seconded by Senator Chaudhry, that the minutes of January 20, 2011 be adopted as circulated.

Senator Christie noted an addition to the January 20, 2011 minutes, under the Informal Session, 3. Functions of the Senate: "Principal Woolf noted that the Queen's University Planning Committee (QUPC) serves in an advisory capacity only."

The motion was approved as amended.

Carried 11-14

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

None Received

4. Provost's Report (Appendix B, page 12)

a) Preliminary Report of the Enrolment Planning Task Force

Senator Silverman drew attention to the report that was distributed with the agenda. The task force is working on various enrolment strategies with the goal of producing a long-term plan. The principles outlined in the preliminary report will guide this long-term plan and will also take into consideration several factors including:

- The academic planning process
- Residential capacity
- Student demand and demographics.

The task force is examining on- and off-campus enrolment strategies and will produce a planning document. The task force welcomes input on its preliminary report.

b) Masters of Engineering Tuition Fees

Senator Silverman noted that at its May 2010 meeting, the Board of Trustees approved a domestic tuition fee structure for graduate programs that recommended no increase in tuition levels from 2010-2011 until further analysis. A review of programs in the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science determined that Queen's has significantly lower fee levels in select Masters of Engineering Professional programs than other universities.

These changes will be proposed to the Board at its meeting on March 4, 2011.

c) Budget Process

At the January 20, 2011 meeting, Senator Silverman noted the formation of the Provost Advisory Budget Committee to guide him and the Principal on budget decisions. The Budget process needs to be creative and all ideas to generate new revenue and other innovations are welcome. Difficult decisions will have to be made this year and overall budget planning for the next three years will be challenging.

d) Financial Situation

Senator Silverman and VP (Finance and Administration) C. Davis released an update today on the impact of philanthropic giving on the University. An update on the pension situation will follow shortly.

e) QUASR

The Student Online University System (SOLUS), a new student self-service support centre to replace QCARD, will be in service on March 9, 2011 and is one of a series of critical changes to the Student Information System. Faculties and schools will use the new system to submit grades and process other routine requests. An advisory team with representation from all faculties has supported the implementation process. More information is available on the University Registrar's website.

f) Graduate Student Accessibility Training

The Graduate Studies Executive Council has passed a motion requiring that, effective September 2011, all incoming graduate students must complete an online course on accessibility training. As future academic leaders, they need to be equipped to contribute to an inclusive culture. This is an important step in advancing accessibility at Queen's.

g) Planning

As chair of the Enrolment Planning Task Force and the Queen's University Planning Committee, the Provost plays a major role in University planning. The Senate discussion on Academic Planning later in the meeting is another critical part of this focus on improved planning.

5. Other Reports requested by Senate

None Received

II QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions from Senator Morelli

1. Page 6 (of November 25, 2010 minutes): The first action of the Academic Task Force was to be to devise a work plan, including a timeline to be presented to Senate for approval at the January 20, 2011 meeting. This did not occur.

Why has this work plan, including a timeline not been presented to Senate for approval?

2. (Item 2 of SCAD recommendations from its November 25 Report to Senate): The Academic Planning Task Force was directed to establish sub-committees focused on specific issues salient to the Academic Plan, for example internationalization, scope of degree offerings, ...

Have these sub-committees been formed? If not, why not? If so, what is their progress?

3. (Item 2 of SCAD recommendations from their Nov 25 report to Senate): The Academic Planning Task Force was directed to consult widely through the sub-committees by holding open meetings with experts and representatives of stakeholders, and by holding town hall meetings...

Why have these open meetings and town hall meeting not yet been scheduled after nearly two months?

4. Page 8 (of Nov 25, 2010 minutes): The Senate has mandated that a series of widely accessible town hall meetings be sponsored and that the process advance with all possible expedition ...

a) Again, why haven't these meetings been scheduled yet after nearly two months?

[Secretary's note: The conditions listed above were not formally approved by the Senate on November 25, 2010.]

b) Does the Academic planning Task Force have a plan and timeline to accomplish its mission prior to the end of April 2011 as was mandated by the Senate?

5. (Issue from the Queen's Students and Employees for Real Academic Planning Open Letter): Town Hall meetings were to occur to consult on specific key issues including: expanding Year 1 and 2 classrooms in order to protect upper-year class sizes, virtualization of classrooms, and re-weighting of course credits,

When will these consultations take place? What format is envisioned for them?

6. **Have the members of the Academic Planning Task Force been provided with the basic information necessary to carry out their mandate, such as the unit head's responses to Principal Woolf's "Where Next" document? If not, why not?**

P. Taylor, Chair of the Senate Academic Planning Task Force, thanked Senator Morelli for the opportunity to respond to his questions. He noted that the task force is a diverse group and took some time to find common ground. It is now on its way and now has an interactive website. Open town-hall meetings have already been scheduled; two of these will take place with the AMS and the SGPS. Consultations with faculties and those with specific expertise will also take place. The task force welcomes feedback and hopes to see much of this through virtual discussion threads on the website.

The unit heads' responses to Principal Woolf's "Where Next?" document were given under the assumption that they were not public documents. The task force is waiting to see if they might be publicized with permission.

The Chair noted that any further questions should be directed to the Senate Agenda Committee for inclusion on the next agenda.

III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Academic Development (Appendix C, page 26)

a) Enrolment Plan 2011 – 2012

Senator Silverman noted that the report recommends an increase of no more than 100 first-entry undergraduate enrolment in 2011. Previously approved graduate targets remain in programs that have not reached their enrolment targets and where faculty capacity exists.

Moved by Senator Silverman, seconded by Senator Morelli, that Senate approve the Enrolment Plan for 2011-2012 and that Senate empower the University Registrar to make any adjustments as are necessary and appropriate for specific program goals and opportunities to ensure that the total projected enrolment for 2011-2012 is achieved.

Carried 11-15

2. Academic Planning Task Force (Appendix D, page 36)

a) Small group discussions on three critical questions

Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Tolmie, that Senate move into Informal Session to discuss questions posted by the Task Force, chaired by Senator Stairs.

Carried 11-16

After its preliminary oral report to Senate on January 20, the Academic Planning Task Force (APTF) requested an Informal Session at Senate on February 17. Sixty minutes was scheduled to discuss three questions proposed by the Senate Academic Planning Committee. Observers, guests and visitors joined senators to number off into four groups to discuss the following topics:

1. Writing

How can we best integrate the teaching and learning of writing with the learning of specific disciplines? (Group 1)

2. Inquiry

What is the best way to design a class, curriculum or program to enhance students' experience with inquiry? (Group 2)

3. Interdisciplinarity

What is the best way to design a program that will give our students genuine interdisciplinary experiences? (Group 3)

The Chair introduced Academic Planning Committee members: Senators Fachinger, Jones and Reeve, C. Rudnicki, S. Tanner and P. Taylor (Absent: Senators Flanagan and Remenda). Chair P. Taylor outlined the purpose of the session before attendees split into groups.

Following the discussions, a representative from each group delivered a brief report. The notes from each group were submitted on memory sticks. Main themes from these reports follow.

Group 1: Writing

The group was asked what it thought of the English Department letter, and especially of its propositions that the performance or mastery of a discipline is largely coextensive with the ability to write in that discipline and that writing should therefore be taught in connection with disciplines: are there academic units for which this is not true? Response (including members from Biology, Computing Science, Drama, Education, English, History, Math, and Mechanical Engineering) strongly confirmed the letter's position, and there was broad and strong support for the need to improve students' writing abilities in general. Even Math and Biology members affirmed that writing is an important disciplinary skill, and there was strong support for teaching writing in departments, in connection with specific disciplines. However, one member suggested that it might be semi-centralized, such that all arts/humanities students could be taught in one writing course, all science students in another, all social science students in another.

When one member questioned whether the university should have to teach basic skills like writing, others affirmed that if students generally arrive without writing skills they need to acquire them in university. It was suggested that poor writing skills are due to lack of reading and that students should be required to read more.

Members affirmed the need for attention to marking practices, and for ensuring that student writing be marked by professors or well trained TAs, since poor marking can do more damage than good. A member from Mechanical engineering stressed the need for students to receive help from experts in technical writing, i.e., from those who will focus on their writing as writing, rather than on its content. Another member doubted that a single course in writing would suffice for most university students, and suggested that writing needs to be emphasized throughout university, perhaps with instruction in "general writing" preceding instruction in discipline-specific writing.

Group 2: Inquiry

- Inquiry-based learning is essential and should figure prominently in first-year studies.
- Some faculties place more emphasis on this than others. Grad students should be involved in teaching inquiry-based learning; however, resources are necessary for the training of such students.
- Big lectures, particularly in first year, do not often capture the students' attention and focus. A number of teaching projects are under way to replace or supplement the large lecture by other means. A significant example of this is found in Psych 100 in which the students are subdivided into a large number of small tutorials run by TAs who are often senior undergraduates.
- Look at other universities/programs that currently use inquiry-based learning.
- Facilitates students' ability to apply new knowledge in novel situations and increases their accountability
- Inquiry cannot be implemented at the expense of content
- Changing role of instructor –rather than simply providing facts but expanding to motivating and encouraging inquiry through case studies, etc.
- Promote level of engagement in lectures, such as use of i-clickers

Group 3: Interdisciplinarity

It is essential to define what we mean by this term. It can mean an experience in which the student must bring ideas and techniques from two or more disciplines to bear on the understanding or solution of a problem.

There can be tension between a strong grounding in a discipline and interdisciplinary studies. A first-year universal course should be established and provide a foundation to carry through to future years. Such a course would need to emphasize intellectual orientation rather than the current emphasis on social orientation. Program and curriculum design are key components of this.

- Might include a number of inquiry skills necessary for all undergraduates
- Provide intellectual orientation, what it means to be a university student
- Writing (or writing course) might provide a focus as essential but widely required skill for success at university

We should seek funding from Advancement, research initiatives, etc., to provide resources. Curricular and financial infrastructure needs to be established centrally to incorporate interdisciplinarity

Group 4: Communication (had no assigned question and this was their choice).

This topic included writing and interdisciplinarity as well as oral fluency.

- Increased class sizes result in decreased opportunities for students to speak.
- Queen's should create small introductory classes; the trade-off, if necessary, would be to increase the size of upper-year classes.
- Redesign tutorials, seminars, rotate instructors (embrace change; give things up)
- Establish University standards for Communication – will academic freedom present a barrier?
- Units (departments and faculties) would be required to figure out how to implement the University standard within programs/discipline specifics.
- There are two sides to learning—what Queen's should deliver, and what is expected from students.
- Issues of diversity, equity, the existing Eurocentric curriculum have not been mentioned. The Academic Planning Task Force is talking about Global Citizenship.
- Interdisciplinary collaboration will not be successful through a top-down mandate. Provide a newsfeed of initiatives/activities to stimulate connections.
- The Academic Plan will have to identify the trade-offs necessary to survive.
- The APTF acknowledges the vast body of literature and expertise and is tapping into these resources to identify best practices.
- APTF is very sensitive to the challenge of making Faculty-specific recommendations – The Academic Plan will be a broad statement of principles and it will be the job of Faculties and departments to implement what they can
- Listen to students; they tell others about programs

Senators noted the following:

- A return to the approach of an introductory foundation course for all students
- Students cannot be expected to do more with uninteresting lectures, however professors should be allowed to expect more of their students and set a higher standard for them.
- Task force should consult the extensive research literature on this higher education on this area in order to make informed decisions
- Consult campus experts at the Centre for Teaching and Learning
- Often when interdisciplinarity is discussed it is actually multidisciplinary; this definition still needs clarification
- Interdisciplinarity is difficult to implement from the top down

- Good collaborations often happen by accident
- The academic planning process is meant to be a broad statement of principles; the detail will come at the department level
- It is important to consider student feedback when implementing curriculum changes
- Seeing how, instead of seeing what students learn is important
- Third- and fourth-year students are excellent resources when considering teaching with limited resources.

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

Carried 11-17

Senate resumed its Regular Business

3. **Advisory Research** (Appendix E, page 37)
 - a) **CORE status changed to Research Group**
There were no questions or comments.
 - b) **Request for formal centre status for the Centre for Energy and Power Electronics Research (ePower)**

Moved by Senator Reid, seconded by Senator Morelli, that Senate approve the establishment of the Centre for Energy and Power Electronics Research (ePower) as a faculty-based centre.

Carried 11-18

4. **Agenda** (Appendix F, page 78)
 - a) **Senate meeting dates 2011-2012**

Moved by Senator Reid, seconded by Senator Crowell, that Senate approve the amendment to the Senate Rules of Procedure as described in Appendix F, page 78.

Carried 11-19

Moved by Senator Reid, seconded by Senator Crowell, that Senate approve the 2011-2012 meeting dates listed below:

Tuesday, September 27, 2011
Monday, October 24, 2011
Tuesday, November 22, 2011
Tuesday, January 24, 2012
Tuesday, February 28, 2012
Tuesday, March 27, 2012
Tuesday, April 17, 2012
Tuesday, May 22, 2012
Meetings begin at 3:30 p.m.

Carried 11-20

5. Nominating (Appendix G, page 80)

a) Elections

Chair P. Oosthuizen noted a request to add an additional name to the report.

Moved Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator Culham, that Senate approve the elections of those named in the report in Appendix G, page 80 to the committees indicated with the addition of the name of undergraduate Arts and Science student L. Boulos to the Senate Orientation Activities Review Board.

Carried 11-21

6. Operations Review

a) Functions of the Senate – Oral update from Chair

Senator Stairs reported that since the January Senate meeting, SORC had continued to discuss the topic and had received helpful feedback from the two informal sessions at Senate meetings over the past academic year. It expects to present a legal opinion from the University Lawyer on the functions, as well as a formal report, including further revisions to the Proposed Functions of Senate at the March 24, 2011 Senate meeting.

7. Queen's University Planning Committee

Senator Silverman reported that the QUPC recently held its third meeting of the academic year. It endorsed the establishment of the Centre for Energy and Power Electronics Research (ePower) as a faculty-based centre, discussed academic initiatives, the Enrolment Planning Task Force report and PeopleSoft issues. The QUPC will meet again in March and also in April, to discuss the University's budget situation.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES

None Received

V MOTIONS

None Received

VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE

- 1. Research Report** (Appendix H, page 81)
- 2. Extension of review deadlines for the Centre for Health Services and Policy Research (CHSPR) and the Queen's Cancer Research Institute (CRI)** (Appendix I, page 85)

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES (Appendix J, page 86)

- 1. Proposed amendments to the name, terms of reference and composition of the IARC** [Referred to Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC)]

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

None Received

IX CLOSED SESSION

Not Required

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:18 pm.