



Minutes

MEETING OF THE SENATE

A meeting of the Senate was held on Tuesday, November 22nd, 2011 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

Present: D. Woolf (Chair) **Senators:** Abdollah, Adams, Bevan, Blennerhassett, Bowers, Brouwer, Burford-Grinnell, Campbell, Chapman, Cheng, Chowdhury, Cole, Culham, De Souza, Dimitrakopoulos, Dimitrov, Egnatoff, Elliott, El-Rahimy, Fachinger, Flanagan, Foo, Garvie, Harrison, Hart, Hillman, Hird, Johnson, LaFleche, Lamoureux, MacDougall, MacKinnon, MacLean, Maurice, McIntire, Medves, Morelli, Murray, Newcomb, Oleschuk, Oosthuizen, Parker, Reid, Remenda, Reznick, Saunders, Shearer, Sienna, Sullivan, Tierney, Tripp, Walters, Wang, Whitehead, Woodhouse, Dickey Young, Young, G. Moore (Secretary), C. Russell (Associate)

Also Present: T. Alm, M. Alquire, A. Arauz, S. Aziz, W. Cairncross, C. Christie, P. Cohoe, R. Coupland, R. Denniston-Stewart, M. Dineen, I. Duchaine, A. Eagan, H. Everson, N. Francis, R. Garcia, J. Grimoldby, E. Hanson, M. Heeler, E. Hollenbeck, J. Holmes, H. Jien, M. Jones, D. Kelly, E. Kent, R. Lemieux, G. Lessard, L. Long, G. MacAllister, S. Marlin, K. McInnis, K. Julien-Michels, K. Moran, S. Murphy, K. O'Brien, K. Owsik, L. Peterson, I. Reeve, S. Rigden, K. Sellars, T. Sherman, K. Slobodin, M. Smallridge, G. Smith, H. Smith, C. Sumbler, S. Tanner, P. Taylor, A. Vrana-Godwin, K. Wallace, P. Watkin, J. Whittaker, J. Winton, D. Woodward, M. Zeng, E. Zielke

I OPENING SESSION

The Chair welcomed attendees to the last Senate meeting of the term. He gave a special welcome to new ASUS student senators Chapman, Hillman and Sullivan.

1. Adoption of Agenda

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

Senator Campbell presented a motion on the institution of formalized procedures for suspension of admissions to academic programs and requested that it be added to the agenda under V Motions.

Moved by Senator Campbell, seconded by Senator Reid, that the agenda be adopted as amended.
Carried 11-67

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 24 October 2011 (Appendix A, page 1)

Senator Adams requested an amendment be made to a comment attributed to her on page 6. She said that the tone of her comment was not "noting" but rather she made a pointed suggestion that the huge amount of work taken on by the Academic Planning Task Force deserved to be recognized by appropriate reductions in other duties.

Moved by Senator Reznick, seconded by Senator MacLean, that the minutes be adopted as amended.

Carried 11-68

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

None

4. Principal's Report

The Principal wished students good luck in their exams and thanked staff and faculty for their valued contributions and dedication. He encouraged people to attend the annual Staff Appreciation Reception on Monday, December 5.

Other topics included:

- The John Orr Dinner November 19 in Toronto honouring former Principal Tom Williams. The usual Queen's Bands performance was cancelled. Extremely offensive Bands membership materials were brought to the University's attention earlier in the month. Conditions placed on the Bands by the University and the AMS include the cancellation of performances for the rest of the fall term. The University and the AMS are working with the Bands on a positive path forward and resumption of performances in the New Year
- Lieutenant-Governor David Onley's November 22 Throne Speech at Queen's Park citing health care and education as the province's most important issues
- A Memorandum of Understanding announcement that Queen's and St. Lawrence College will develop new opportunities for teaching and research partnerships
- The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada meeting in Montreal
- The second Forum on Military and Veteran Health Research hosted by RMC and Queen's to explore ways to enhance the health and well-being of military personnel, veterans and their families
- A new book entitled *Academic Reform* by Ian Clark, former President of COU, and colleagues has added to the media commentary on the value of a university education in today's world
- Thanks to all those who participated in the 23-month, broadly consultative process leading to the creation of the University's Academic Plan, including the extensive contributions of the Academic Planning Task Force, the Academic Writing team and the faculty, staff and students who participated.

5. Provost's Report (Appendix B, page 14)

a) Report to Senate

The Provost answered a question about the structure of the new Vice-Principals' Operations Committee (VPOC). It is an informal committee where VPs can share information and communicate decisions which may have implications across portfolios.

6. Other Reports Requested by Senate

a) Enrolment Report – oral update by Interim University Registrar T. Alm

T. Alm reported that the 2011-2012 enrolment report is to be submitted to the Senate in January, once reporting for the November 1 count is submitted to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities by mid-December. T. Alm reported on the following highlights from the preliminary report:

- Undergraduate enrolment appears to be on target with the Senate Enrolment Plan; enrolments have met or exceeded overall targets in most programs. In comparison to last

year (2010-2011) the actual full-time undergraduate enrolment has increased, across all years, by approximately 500 students.

- Enrolment in both the first-year and upper-years at the Bader International Study Center is below target
- The School of Graduate Studies has experienced growth in both Masters and Doctoral programs over the 2010-2011 actual enrolment; however, the growth is below the 2011 enrolment targets
- Enrolment in MBA programs is on target, and significant enrolment growth has occurred in the Master of Management programs
- International undergraduate enrolment has increased slightly; the total number of international graduate students has increased by approximately 100 students. The international undergraduate student population is approximately 5 per cent and at the graduate level more than 20 per cent of total enrolment
- Total full-time undergraduate and graduate enrolment is nearly 20,000.

II QUESTION PERIOD (Appendix C page 16)

1. From Senator Morelli on the suspension of admissions to the Bachelor of Fine Art (BFA) program

Question 1

I request that the Dean of Arts and Science provide Senate with the rationale and the process by which this decision was made; for example, was the Faculty Board consulted?

Oral responses provided by Dean A. MacLean and University Counsel D. Kelly.

The Dean clarified that the decision to suspend admissions to the BFA program for 2012-13 affects the Fine Art program only and not the other creative arts programs: Art History, Art Conservation, Drama, Film and Media, or Music. Currently, 107 undergraduate students are enrolled in the BFA program and 974 undergraduate and 89 graduate students are enrolled in the other programs. The usual annual intake for the BFA program is about 30 students.

One faculty member in Fine Art is about to retire out of a total of three full and one half-time faculty members. Each teaches in his or her own area of expertise. Given the financial constraints on replacing retired faculty, it was felt that it would not be responsible to allow students to apply for the 2012-13 year.

Since applications had started to arrive, and knowing the amount of effort that portfolio preparation requires, it was important to make the decision promptly. The Dean decided that it was important to notify those in the program before making a public announcement. In retrospect, a public announcement to be timed for release immediately after the internal announcement would have been a better route.

With respect to resource issues, the Dean acted within his decanal authority to request that the Registrar's office suspend admissions to the program. The Dean intends to report the decision to the Committee of Departments and to the Faculty Board but neither body is responsible to make the decision.

He noted that the rationale and the process by which the BFA decision was made is identical to one used several years ago when admission to a number of low-enrolment degree concentrations was suspended due to budget pressures. That decision was challenged at the Faculty Board. A legal opinion established that the Dean's authority to take this action derives from the Board of Trustees as it was and is a resource issue.

In the Dean's opinion, no Faculty or Senate policies have been violated and thus Senate's responsibility to "approve university-level policies" is not impugned. In the case of the decision made several years ago, following discussions with the relevant departments and in accordance with Faculty Board policy, changes to the programs in question were subsequently brought before Faculty Board for discussion and approval.

University Counsel D. Kelly stated that the Dean does have the authority to make administrative decisions of this nature. The decision itself is operational, not one of policy, and therefore falls outside the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Question 2

a) The Dean of Arts and Science has said that the Faculty will work with the Fine Arts program to examine options for the future. What are these options and do they include provisions to avert closure of the program?

The Dean noted that discussions with the BFA program have just begun and it would be premature to discuss options available. For many years it has been a Faculty policy to offer a broad range of choices to its students and this has to be balanced against the resources available. This is the perspective within which discussions will take place.

A committee including faculty, staff and students has been set up to make recommendations on the BFA program's future. The co-chairs are the Director of the BFA program Kathleen Sellars and Associate Dean Gordon Smith; members are the Undergraduate Chair of the BFA Program, Jan Winton, Acting Associate Dean (Studies) David Pugh, and one BFA student from each year of the program. The first meeting took place on Nov. 22 and the committee plans to meet weekly.

The Dean thanked students and alumni who have written offering support. The committee and faculty will try to engage them as planning continues.

b) How does the Dean intend to address faculty renewal issues, in general, and specifically related to the Fine Arts program?

The Dean noted that he will deploy available resources to the area of greatest need. It is important to bear in mind the loss of positions across the Faculty and not just in one program.

From 2007 to 2011, the number of faculty in Arts and Science decreased by 46 positions from 476 to 430. In 2012, 25 per cent of faculty in nine departments or programs will be in the 62-plus age range. Next year, the Faculty will be able to fund three positions in total. It is increasingly difficult to cover the current level of retirements, let alone anticipated retirements over the next several years.

c) Are there any other programs that the Dean foresees will be cut, closed, or have its admission suspended during the next three years?

The Dean noted that numerous factors affect the accuracy of a prediction. The Faculty has no control over when faculty members choose to retire. He observed that programs that are functioning well, that have anticipated the impact of retirements, and that are responding creatively to the current economic environment should not be at risk.

Question 3

Will the Principal convey:

- a) the concerns of many Senators and others about this decision to the Board of Trustees, and;**
- b) explain that the Board's directive for a balanced budget is causing a serious deterioration of academic quality at Queen's?**

a) The Principal noted that it is a function of the Chair of Senate to communicate Senate's concerns to the Board and the Board's concerns to the Senate and that he would do so. He also noted that he frequently speaks to Board members not only in formal reports to the Board and its committees but also in conversations with the Chair and individual Board members.

b) The Principal said he understood and would convey Senate's concerns about the Board's directive for a balanced budget in his next report to the Board. However, he observed that the Board's directive for a balanced budget is not the cause of the University's financial crisis. The University is spending more money than the revenue it receives.

Question 4

- a) Is it the Provost's position that this every-unit-for-itself budget model is to be implemented, or is the Provost willing to consider alternatives?**

Provost Harrison described the budget model as being more nuanced, and did not characterize it as being "every-unit-for-itself." Using the example of an Applied Science student taking an undergraduate Physics course, the attribution of revenue allows for many alternatives with major consequences. There are numerous implementation options that the Provost plans to review and discuss in the coming months. Cross subsidies may be appropriate; the budget model will make them transparent.

- b) Is the recently announced open session with the Queen's community, where the Provost and the Vice-Principal (Finance and Administration) will make a brief presentation and answer questions on the budget and planning process, meant simply to be an information session to explain how it is going to be, or an opportunity to seek input and broad consultation?**

The Provost noted that he and VP (Finance and Administration) C. Davis will host an open session on the budget next month; this will be the first of a series. With reference to consultation, the Provost said that planned visits by Queen's officials to the University of Michigan and the University of Toronto to discuss budget models will be reciprocated by visits to Queen's by officials from these institutions so that the community can ask questions about the implementation of their budget models.

In answer to a question from Senator Morelli, the Provost said that there are no plans to recruit any additional vice-provosts.

III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Academic Planning Task Force (Appendix D, page 18)

- a) Approval of Queen's University Academic Plan 2011

Moved by Senator Remenda, seconded by Senator Flanagan,

- (a) that the Senate approve the Queen's University Academic Plan 2011 and its supporting Four Pillars;**

(b) that the Senate publish and disseminate these documents as a guide for the entire academic community: the students, the staff, the faculty, alumni and friends;

(c) that the Senate encourage the academic leadership, including the Provost, the Vice-Principals, the Deans and the Department Heads, to be guided by the principles of the Plan in planning decisions and to implement the recommendations when possible and practicable within the resources available.

(d) that the Senate endorse a continuous cycle of Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring under the leadership of the Provost.

Senator Remenda noted that extensive consultation that took place in the creation of the Academic Plan and that the Task Force is unanimous in its support of the Plan.

Professor M. Jones presented to the Senate printouts of two electronic petitions requesting that Senate not approve the Academic Plan as presented by the APTF:

- “Friends of Queen’s Petition” concerning the Academic Plan (62 signatures)
- “Petition concerning the Academic Plan” (787 signatures, of which 156 were not entirely verified)

He also presented a related “Petition concerning Admission Freezes and Closures” (580 signatures).

M. Jones observed that he and the petitioners supported an alternative motion proposed by Senator Morelli (Agenda item V, Motions, Appendix I2, page 88). While recognizing that the APTF had accomplished much, he made three objections to the APTF’s motion: (1) That its designation of the Academic Plan was ambiguous; did its plan consist of pages 2-13 or of the whole text? (2) That its proposal (d) for continuing planning would place academic planning “under the leadership of the Provost,” whereas the Senate should have stewardship of academic planning; and (3) That the APTF motion proposed that Senate accept its draft as a completed plan, as the “Queen’s University Academic Plan,” whereas it was far from complete. M. Jones noted several major aspects of the University and challenges confronting it about which the APTF draft was entirely silent, including graduate and professional studies, faculty renewal, virtualization and online studies and research in relation to teaching. M. Jones urged that Senate could adopt what was positive in the APTF’s draft and process without pretending that its draft was a complete academic plan.

Senator Morelli presented an amendment to the motion proposed by the Task Force. Printed copies of the amendment were distributed to senators at the meeting.

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Fachinger,

(a) that the Senate approve the Queen’s University Academic Plan 2011, which consists of a 13-page Academic Plan summary and its supporting Four four Pillars, and will serve as a first and more comprehensive in a series of Senate Academic Planning documents;

(b) that the Senate publish and disseminate ~~these documents~~ this document as a guide for the entire academic community: the students, the staff, the faculty, alumni and friends;

(c) that the Senate encourage the academic leadership, including the Provost, the Vice-Principals, the Deans and the Department Heads, to be guided by the principles of the Plan in planning decisions and to implement the recommendations when possible and practicable within the resources available;

(d) that the Senate endorse a continuous cycle of Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring ~~under the leadership of the Provost~~ by:

- (i) **striking each fall a task force of students, staff, and faculty who, using the consultation process established by the 2010-2011 APTF, shall consider a new planning issue or set of issues to be recommended by the task force of the previous year. As a starting point for the 2011-2012 academic year the 2010-2011 APTF recommends that consideration be given to the issues of (1) virtualization and online learning, and (2) faculty renewal.**
- (ii) **each such task force shall submit its Report, including recommendations and observations concerning the implementation of previous recommendations, to Senate for approval.**

Senator Walters proposed a sub-amendment to section (d) in the amended motion.

Moved by Senator Walters, seconded by Senator Flanagan, that item (d) be changed to the following: “that the Senate endorse a continuous cycle of Planning, Implementation and Monitoring under a process to be determined by the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC).”

Senator Morelli urged senators to vote against the sub-amendment. In his view, the process should not be put in the hands of the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC). Senator Fachinger said that the amended motion she and Senator Morelli propose addresses the issue of ongoing academic planning.

Several senators discussed the advantages of and drawbacks of involving the Senate Operations Review Committee in striking a standing committee.

The Chair observed that Senator Walter’s sub-amendment did not propose that SORC take on academic planning. Instead, the motion states that SORC should be asked to render an opinion on what type of body should do this work. He cautioned Senate against departing from current procedures regarding establishment of committees and task forces.

Senator Remenda expressed concern with the amendments to (d) (i), because the Task Force did not discuss some of the points listed. Its mandate was to create an academic plan, not to create a means by which planning would continue; this is the job of Senate.

The sub-amendment was defeated (32-25).

The Chair invited Senator Morelli to speak to the main motion as amended. In his view, his amendment reflects the views of the majority of the University community at large. The job given to the Task Force was overly ambitious. The amendment seeks to implement an ongoing planning process that is equitable and not overly prescriptive.

Senator Morelli clarified that, should the main motion pass as amended, he would withdraw his motion on the Academic Plan under V Motions, Appendix I2, Page 88.

P. Taylor, Chair of the Academic Planning Task Force, noted that many people said that several things were left out of the Academic Plan, including blended learning and faculty renewal. He observed that the committee became entangled with the issues and challenges that are the result of challenging financial times, and that the work was not about resource allocation; rather the allocation of scarce resources.

Several senators commented on the amendment. During discussion of the membership of the next Academic Planning Task Force, the normal Senate nominating process was deemed by some to lack transparency and an election process was suggested as a more robust alternative. Senator D. Moore said

that ongoing concerted efforts to improve the Plan are important and that the amended motion anticipated graduate students' concerns.

On vote, the motion to proceed to the main motion as amended was approved.

Carried 11-69

39 in favour, 17 opposed.

Senator Morelli said that in his view, the amendments to the main motion as a good compromise and that they address the concerns of M. Jones and others opposed to the original motion to approve the Academic Plan.

- (a) **that the Senate approve the Queen's University Academic Plan 2011, which consists of a 13-page Academic Plan summary and its supporting Four four Pillars, and will serve as a first and more comprehensive in a series of Senate Academic Planning documents;**
- (b) **that the Senate publish and disseminate ~~these documents~~ this document as a guide for the entire academic community: the students, the staff, the faculty, alumni and friends;**
- (c) **that the Senate encourage the academic leadership, including the Provost, the Vice-Principals, the Deans and the Department Heads, to be guided by the principles of the Plan in planning decisions and to implement the recommendations when possible and practicable within the resources available;**
- (d) **that the Senate endorse a continuous cycle of Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring under the leadership of the Provost by:**
 - (i) **striking each fall a task force of students, staff, and faculty who, using the consultation process established by the 2010-2011 APTF, shall consider a new planning issue or set of issues to be recommended by the task force of the previous year. As a starting point for the 2011-2012 academic year the 2010-2011 APTF recommends that consideration be given to the issues of (1) virtualization and online learning, and (2) faculty renewal.**
 - (ii) **each such task force shall submit its Report, including recommendations and observations concerning the implementation of previous recommendations, to Senate for approval.**

Carried 11-70

On vote, the main motion as amended was approved 52-0.

The Chair noted that, notwithstanding some differences of opinion, Queen's now has a coherent academic plan and that two years of discussion have successfully come to a conclusion. He recorded his personal thanks to the Task Force and to all Queen's community members involved in the process.

Moved by Senator Culham, seconded by Senator Reid, that the Academic Planning Task Force be dissolved, with the thanks of Senate.

Carried 11-71

Due to the time, Senator Morelli suggested that Senate proceed directly to the action items and if time permitted, to consider the information items remaining on the agenda.

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator El-Rahimy, that the Agenda be amended to proceed to V MOTIONS, 1. Official Grading System, that Motion 2. Academic Plan be withdrawn and that Motion 3. on the BFA program submitted by Senator Campbell be considered.

Carried 11-72

2. Nominating (Appendix E, page 73)

a) Elections

Moved by Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator MacLean, that Senate approve the election of those named in Appendix E, page 73, be elected to the committees indicated.

Carried 11-73

3. Operations Review Committee (Appendix F, page 74)

a) Report to Senate – update on Senate Committee Review Project
There were no questions.

4. Orientation Activities Review Board (Appendix G, page 76)

a) Annual Report to Senate on Orientation 2011

In answer to a question about academic content during Orientation Week, Co-Chair C. Coupland clarified that the intent was to prepare students for classes by describing to them how academic programs are structured. It is an opportunity to reflect the type of social, academic and personal balance students can expect during their time at Queen's.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND AFFILIATED COLLEGES

(Appendix H, page 79)

1. Orientation Reports

- a) Education
- b) Graduate Studies
- c) Law
- d) Medicine

There were no comments or questions.

V MOTIONS (Appendix I, page 87)

1. Official Grading System– Submitted by Senator Morelli

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Johnson that Senate ask the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP) to require all Faculties and Schools to report to SCAP about the provisions they have implemented concerning grading practices and to confirm that the necessary corrective action has been taken to eliminate any disadvantage, and that SCAP report back to Senate in February with its findings.

Carried 11-74

Senator Morelli acknowledged that good work is being done by some faculties and schools to ensure that students are not disadvantaged by the new GPA system. However, some Arts and Science students have approached him to say that they fear they will be unable to graduate because the system has been

applied retroactively to their marks. When the GPA system was implemented, assurances were given there would be no negative implications. In Senator Morelli's view, students' mental health has been negatively impacted.

Senator Parker said that as a Con-Ed student she supported the motion and that the GPA system puts Education students at a disadvantage and should be reviewed. Senator Elliott, Dean of the Faculty of Education, clarified that much discussion had taken place about the changes. The new GPA system that provides a grade is an advantage to Education students because the former system in Education was strictly pass-fail.

Senator MacLean observed that the new GPA system has produced some changes that need to be investigated to ensure that no students are unfairly disadvantaged.

2. Academic Plan - Submitted by Senator Morelli

Senator Morelli withdrew his motion.

3. Motion regarding the Bachelor of Fine Arts Program

Moved by Senator Campbell seconded by Senator Johnson, that Senate task the Senate Committee on Academic Development (SCAD) to create a policy document which outlines a formal procedure for the suspension of academic programs and/or suspension of admissions to academic programs. This policy shall incorporate consultation with those faculty members and students in the program being considered and come before the appropriate governance bodies, and that SCAD then propose such policy to be approved by Senate at the February meeting.

Senator Campbell explained that the motion arose from discussions about the decision by the Faculty of Arts and Science to suspend 2012-13 admissions to the Bachelor of Fine Arts program. The intent is to ensure that enough thought is put into decisions of this nature. She noted that the Bachelor of Fine Arts program was highlighted at Fall Preview, even though the decision to suspend admissions to the program had been made a few days earlier, reflecting poorly on the institution as a whole to prospective students, some of whom had flown into campus only to learn that the program was not accepting applications. In her view, a committee should have been struck prior to the decision to suspend admissions to investigate the matter.

At 5:30 p.m., it was

Moved by Senator Morelli, seconded by Senator Remenda to extend the meeting to 5:50 p.m.

Carried 11-75

Senator Remenda noted that the February deadline did not give SCAD much time to do its work and suggested a friendly amendment to remove the deadline or include a different month.

Senator Cole, SCAD Chair, said it is important to distinguish between closure of a program and a suspension. Given SCAD's mandate, she questioned whether it was the right committee to discuss the issue. Given the lateness of the meeting, she suggested that the motion be tabled for discussion at the January 24, 2012 Senate meeting.

Moved by Senator Cole, seconded by Senator Woodhouse that the motion regarding the Bachelor of Fine Arts Program be tabled to the January 24, 2012 Senate meeting.

Carried 11-76

27 in favour; 20 opposed.

VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE
(Appendix J, page 93)

1. Research Report

There were no questions.

2. Exit Poll Survey 2011 <http://www.queensu.ca/registrar/aboutus/reports/exitpoll.html>

There were no questions.

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES

None received

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

None received

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.