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

a)

6. COU Academic Colleague's Report

a) Report to Senate

Senator Oosthuizen spoke to his written report, distributed at the meeting, and appended to the minutes. He informed Senators that the discussion at the meetings addressed many notable items such as the response to the MTCU discussion paper on "Strengthening Ontario's Centre of Creativity, Innovation and Knowledge, the Strategic Mandates submitted by post-secondary institutions, the audit of teaching assessments of University Faculty by the Auditor General of Ontario, and the Educators Accessibility Resource Kit developed by the COU in partnership with York, Guelph and the University of Toronto. He also informed members that the 16th Annual University Fair was a great success. He noted that the David C. Smith Award was presented to Chaviva M. Hošek, O.C. who is also a recipient of four honorary degrees and who is an Officer of the Order of Canada, The award is named for David C. Smith, former Queen's Principal, and the award is given annually at a dinner held in conjunction with the meeting of the COU.

II QUESTION PERIOD

The Chair reminded Members that the Rules of Procedure specify that Question Period is limited to 20 minutes. The Chair felt that adherence to this rule was important to ensure that Senate has sufficient time to devote to items which are on the agenda for action. Accordingly, matters not reached or fully addressed in this period would be held to the end of the Senate Meeting, if time permitted, or would be postponed to the subsequent meeting.

Question #1 from Senator Jones on commercial advertisements on campus (a follow-up from September 25, 2012)

Senator Jones requested that the Provost review the use of corporate advertising in spaces not controlled by the AMS.

Provost's response:

The Provost responded that a framework and guiding principles for the development of a new policy on advertising and commercial activity was created in 2002. This document recommends several restrictions. It suggests, for example, that advertising should not be in classrooms, laboratories or any other space that is devoted to academic purposes. The list of restrictions aligns with those found in the policies of other Canadian universities.

Despite putting this framework into place, Queen's does not currently have a policy on advertising, and nor does it have a policy on the development of University policies. To this end, the Vice-Principals and Provost will work with the University Secretariat to develop a University policy to guide the development of policies. After this policy is in place, a policy on advertising and

disciplinary training in writing. Could the Provost please inform Senate of any plans that the University has for implementing these recommendations?

Provost's response:

The Provost referred to his written report, which notes a plan to establish a task force on the student learning experience and the fundamental academic skills that the Academic Plan identifies as central to the Queen's student learning experience, including effective writing and communication. The goal is to develop a university-wide framework that will emphasize the assessment and evaluation of

the collective agreement between QUFA and Queen's University, was seriously violated" (p. 17). It is well understood that Queen's Administration denies CAUT's jurisdiction in this matter. Yet this jurisdictional distinction does nothing in itself to disprove or discredit the conclusions of the Report, which was published by a highly credible authority, which has been widely and respectfully reported in the media (QUFA Forum provides many of the links), and which has been <u>endorsed by</u> QUFA itself. In view of the significant damage that the Report's conclusions may cause to the university's academic reputation, would the Provost please explain why the Administration has never yet responded to the charges levelled against it? If CAUT's charges are wrong, why not publicly refute them; if they are right, why not simply apologize and show that we can admit and learn from mistakes?

The Provost read the following prepared statement:

"Queen's has consistently taken the position that the CAUT has no jurisdiction in the matter it was asked to investigate. Accordingly, and appropriately, Queen's did not participate in the CAUT investigation. Senator Jones asks why, notwithstanding our unwillingness to participate, we would not pass comment on the report.

The investigation report indicates that matters giving rise to the investigation were referred to the CAUT by QUFA. We do not understand why QUFA elected to refer the matter to the CAUT. A cademic freedom is enshrined in the Queen's-QUFA collective agreement. If it is QUFA sview that at any time a faculty member's rights to academic freedom have been violated, QUFA has access to the grievance procedures in the collective agreement to grieve the University's actions and such a grievance could, if necessary, be adjudicated by an independent third party. This is the process agreed to by QUFA and Queen's in the collective agreement.

I further note that when this particular matter came to light, the University indicated to QUFA that it wished to conduct an investigation, using a process set out in the collective agreement agreed between QUFA and Queen's. QUFA strongly discouraged the University from exercising the provisions of the collective agreement that provide the process for that investigation.

I am not at liberty to say more about the particulars of this matter, both because I would be addressing personnel matters, and also because, in accordance with the express wishes of QUFA, the matter has not been formally investigated by the University. It is sufficient to say that the University does not agree with the conclusions of the CAUT report. Not only are the conclusions based on incomplete information, they are also incorrect. We also disagree with the conclusions on principle, because CAUT has appointed itself both investigator and arbiter. This, as a process, is an inherently conflicted one, and one that we therefore cannot accept. By contrast, the collective agreement gives both parties fair and impartial investigation and review options.

Finally, and as I have said before, and shall say again, I am always open to discussions with QUFA regarding this or other matters of concerns to faculty members."

In response, Senator Jones reiterated that he still has concerns from a reputational perspective that Queen's will not respond directly to the matters expressed by CAUT or in the *Globe and Mail*.

The Prov6(Pror.665 0.desp)-4(a)-(t5(et)5(et,illo)-n5(ati)-5(at)]Tad(m)10(p)-(rec5(a)-(recs5(ersro)-5(n)-5 a)7rev(a)-

and that enrolment planning is one of the primary functions of Senate, could the Provost please explain to Senate why discussions surrounding residence building construction are being brought up to the Board of Trustees before they have come to Senate?

b) Presumably, the Provost's office has some plan for the new residence buildings. Can the Provost elaborate on what stage his internal office is in enrolment planning and why the

wellness and support services available.

- The renovation of three unused gyms in the Physical Education Centre to increase recreational opportunities for students starting next year and ease exam scheduling as of December.
- The introduction of shorter wait times for counselling thanks to a new triage model implemented last fall. This has produced a 20% increase in the number of student contacts and the provision of more counselling hours over the summer. Students in distress are seen within a day or two; many students in immediate crisis are seen the same day.
- Better access to psychiatric services starting last fall with the hiring of an additional part-time psychiatrist.

The commission's final report is expected later this fall, at which time an implementation plan will be put in place.

Research Plan and the final Strategic Mandate Agreement resulting from the Proposed Mandate Statement. The November 5th Queen's University Planning Committee meeting will include further discussion of the development of the Strategic Framework and a report on the progress of the Campus Master Plan.

- 7. Library Committee (Appendix J, page 60)
 - a) Annual Report 2011-2012

The Chair drew members' attention to the Library Committee report included with the agenda and informed members that Senator M. Whitehead, the University Librarian, was in attendance to answer questions. As there were no questions, the Chair thanked Senator Whitehead and the members of the Library Committee for the work being conducted on behalf of Senate.

IV REPORTS OF FACULTIES None Received.

V MOTIONS (Appendix K, page 64)

1. Queen's for-credit courses to pass Curriculum Committee Review submitted by Senator Jones

The Chair reminded members that in order to ensure that procedures are followed and all Senators are heard, no member may speak twice to a motion except to explain a material part of his or her speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood.

Moved by Senator Jones, seconded by Senator Yousefi that Senate task SCAD with reviewing academic approval procedures to ensure that all courses, activities, and programs for which Queen's academic credits are awarded, including those that are on campus, wholly or partly off-campus, wholly or partly online, offered as blended versions of existing courses, offered through Queen's-Blyth or the BISC, developed and/or taught under the auspices of more than one Faculty, and/or develo 0 -1.1St8 ano 0 -1 Faculty for enrolment by students in another Faculty or Faculties, undergo approval by the Curriculum Committee of each Faculty that plays any role in creating, staffing, offering, granting credit for, and/or administering them; and that they be approved by the appropriate unit(s) within each of the departmentalized Faculties.

The motion was defeated on a recorded vote: 20 in favour, 25 against, 1 abstention.

The Chair recognized Assoc5A8(r)5(e)2(di)4(t)4(co)4(urse)8(s 0ygng7(rec)7(o)3(gte)6ve m)9(o)-2 o1(p)-4(a)dic9t(sh c

At this point the Chair called for a vote. It was requested by Senator Morelli that the vote be recorded.

2. Revision of Rules of Procedure submitted by Senator Berkok

Principal Woolf asked Senator Oosthuizen to assume the Chair as he would like to speak to the motion before Senate. Senator Oosthuizen assumed the Chair.

It was moved by Senator Berkok and seconded by Senator Wang that the Rules of Procedure of Senate be revised to include the following:

- 1. That the Principal and Provost reports be included, in writing, along with the release of the Senate agenda.
- 2. That the Principal and Provost use their oral reports at Senate to highlight only key elements of their written reports, and update Senate on any crucial proceedings that occurred between the release of the agenda and the Senate meeting. Oral updates are to be limited to ten minutes each.
- **3.** That any other reports, presentations, or information items be included along with the release of the agenda if they are available by the agenda submission deadline.
- 4. That Section VII of the rules of procedure be amended to move Question Period below Motions in the agenda.

Senators Jones and Morelli requested that item 4 be separated from items 1, 2 and 3 and voted on separately. This request was granted as item 4 was not integral to items 1, 2 and 3.

Senator Berkok was invited to speak to the motion. He noted that there are many important issues for Senate to address and that by strengthening the rules of procedure and modifying the order of the agenda it would provide a better platform for discussion of substantive items

Principal Woolf noted that while he was sympathetic with the spirit of the motion and that he was confident that everyone shares an interest in the matters of Senate being dealt with in a thorough, yet expeditious manner, he had two concerns with the motion. Firstly, he was concerned with procedure and that Senate has a governance structure that has committees appointed to study procedures and that everything in the motion is procedural, yet the Senate Operations Review Committee has not been asked to investigate and report on their recommendations regarding the motion. Matters such as these are not generally decided in Committee of the Whole without first being studied at the committee level. Secondly, the Provost and the Principal, although happy to take guidance from Senate, were concerned with the prescriptive nature of the motion, as it limits the Principal's and Provost's ability to present on substantive matters to no longer than 10 minutes. Principal Woolf agreed that it was healthy for Senate to review its procedures regularly to ensure effi

1. Board of Trustees Meeting - September 25, 2012 (Appendix L, page 66)

The Chair welcomed staff Trustee Dean McKeown to Senate to speak to the Board of Trustees report to Senate. The Chair noted that this is in keeping with the desire expressed at the joint Board/Senate Retreat for more opportunities for communication between the Board and Senate.

Trustee McKeown noted that he appreciated the opportunity to continue the momentum started at the joint Board/Senate Retreat in September and to help Senate put a face to Trustees. He informed Senate that he takes his role as a Trustee very seriously and that it is important that a link be maintained between the Board of Trustees and Senate. He welcomed comments on the report. Senator Morelli expressed his appreciation for the report and welcomed the Board's representative to Senate stating that he hoped that this mechanism continues in the future.

2. Research Report (Appendix M, page 68)

The Chair drew members' attention to the Research Report included with the agenda and informed members that S. Verbeek of the Vice-Principal Research Office was in attendance to answer questions. Seeing none, the Chair thanked Ms. Verbeek for the report and for attending Senate.

The Chair took the opportunity to acknowledge the work of Associate Vice-Provost (Research) Susan Marlin, who is leaving Queen's, and to thank her for her many contributions to Senate and to Queen's. In particular, Ms Marlin served as the Principal's Delegate since 2006 on the Senate Information Technology Committee.

3. Safe Disclosure Reporting and Investigation – Annual Report 2011-2012 (Appendix N, page 71)

The Chair drew members' attention to the Safe Disclosure Reporting and Investigation Annual Report included with the agenda and informed members that the Coordinator of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms, H. Smith was in attendance to answer questions. As there were no questions, the Chair thanked Mr Smith for his attendance at Senate.

VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES (Appendix N, page 54)
1. Changes to Senate Procedure [Referred to the Senate Operations Review Committee (SORC)]

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

Senator Berkok requested to ask an additional question as a follow up to an earlier question on mental health initiatives. As the hour was late, Senator Berkok was asked to submit his question to be addressed at the next Senate meeting.

IX CLOSED SESSION None.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Lon Knox University SeC Tw -3.593ssBrxOTrEES

16th Annual Ontario Universities Fair (OUF): The fair, which was, as usual, held at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre, again appears to have been very successful and was attended by more than 119,000 students and parents. It is the largest educational fair in Canada and one of the largest in North America. Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer (ONCAT):