



#### **4. Principal's Report**

##### Provincial election

The Chair congratulated the AMS and SGPS on their campaigns to get students to vote in the October 6 provincial election. He noted that provincial government is the University's main funding source and that post-secondary education funding had been central to the campaign. He did, however, note that the outlook for post-secondary funding was not promising, given the focus on healthcare

continue to run deficits and live beyond their means. The University is at the mercy of the government, which determines funding related to student enrolment and controls tuition fee increases.<sup>1</sup>

In response to a question from Senator Morelli about capital budgets being funded out of the operating budget, the Chair noted that a business planning process for all new construction projects had been used for the last 1.5 years. All funding has to be in place or identified before construction can begin. The University is servicing the debt on previous construction projects from the operating budget. These decisions were made before any members of the current administration were at the University.

The Chair invited any further questions be submitted in writing to the next Senate meeting to allow time for sufficient discussion of the Academic Plan later in the meeting.

### **III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

#### **1. Nominating** (Appendix E, page 20)

##### **a) Elections**

Senator Blennerhassett clarified that the names of Alternate Chairs of the University Student Appeal Board are provided for the information of Senate and not for approval. The policy authorizes the Secretary of Senate to appoint alternate chairs.

**Moved by Senator Blennerhassett, seconded by Senator Morelli, that Senate approve the elections to committees of the persons named in Appendix E page 20, with the exception of D. Freedman and R. Price, Alternate Chairs of the USAB, whose names are provided to Senate for information.**

**Carried 11-57**

#### **2. Operations Review** (Appendix F, page 21)

##### **a) Proposed interim amendment to the Senate composition**

**Moved by Senator Culham, seconded by Senator Colgan, that, effective immediately, the Deputy Provost position be added to the ex**



- x With respect to the style of teaching and learning prescribed, the Dean strongly supported the view that faculty members should examine alternative, innovative and creative modes of teaching and adopt them where possible or indeed reassert the worth of their current approach. However it was also important to recognize the fundamental principle of academic freedom that faculty members have to determine what is best for their own courses.
- x In a number of cases, Arts and Science and other faculties, are already doing some of the things that are suggested in the report. For example, Arts and Science has close partnerships with the Libraries, the Centre for Teaching and Learning and Information Technology Services in the development of new approaches to teaching. Also, for some time the Faculty has actively encouraged the development of continuing and distance studies. Blended learning initiatives are implemented, or about to be implemented, in a several departments.
- x A number of the issues that are identified in the *Where Next* and *Imagining the Future* documents do not seem to be reflected in the plan. Its strong focus on the Faculty of Arts and Science skews a broader view

Senator MacLean asked whether the plan was to be adopted in detail or would it be seen as a package with *Where Next* and *Imagining the Future* as a set of documents which in broad strokes leads to consideration of new and creative opportunities for faculty, staff and students. He suggested that Senate might want to consider embracing this broader view rather than adopting a plan that supplies a lot of operational details which remain open to scrutiny and possible amendment.

P. Taylor thanked Senator MacLean. While he concurred with the broader view, he noted that the APTF deliberately did not repeat some of the things that were well laid out in the two former documents. There are a lot of recommendations because of a desire to describe examples of what the APTF had in mind.

M. Jones responded to the suggestion that Queen's take *Imagining the Future* and *Where Next* in addition to whatever is produced by the task force as its Plan. He objected because *Where Next* was written before any consultation occurred, and *Imagining the Future* was written before much of the consultation was finished. The Academic Plan, as the Task Force set out to execute it, started with extensive consultation on specific issues, many of which had been voiced in objection to early stages of the planning process. The historical process is important. There are certain things in *Where Next* and *Imagining the Future* that may require reconsideration.

Senator Reznick commented that the four pillars are consonant with the strategic directions in the Faculty of Health Sciences. However, in general the document is undergraduate-centric and could be improved by more of a focus on graduate education as well as professional education. He believed that the Faculty of Health Sciences could support the directions that the plan takes.

P. Taylor acknowledged that the Plan document is Arts and Science oriented in many ways. However, the ideas about fundamental academic literacy apply to graduate school as well as to professional faculties; although in many ways these groups are less diverse and seem to have more internal control. The Task Force will look at that balance.

Senator Remenda, APTF member, said the Task Force believed that some pilot projects should be launched to explore certain of the recommendations and further study of particular recommendations will be necessary. The intention was not to ask Senate to embrace 89 recommendations as the answer. However, the recommendations were also framed following consultation with many people.

Senator Morelli thanked all members of the task force for their long and hard work on a very difficult project that must have consumed a lot of extra time that could have been devoted elsewhere. He encouraged every senator to read the document very carefully and be prepared to discuss it because it goes to the heart of the mission of the Senate.

He noted the positive aspect of the extensive consultations but that the feedback seems to have disappeared from the website and questioned whether it had been archived so that it will remain accessible.

Associate Secretary C. Russell explained that the content of the interactive consultation period was no longer a live feed on the website. It is, however, contained as references in the individual pillar documents.

P. Taylor added that because many of the comments applied to early drafts, and the APTF wanted to avoid any confusion between the final document and its earlier drafts. Given the comment, however, the APTF will review how it can achieve both ends.

M. Jones said that when the APTF started drafting, the website divided into two, so there was one page that had the drafts for the various sections and then there was still the old page that had the four pillars and all the community feedback that all went with them. There was also a page that was basically a schedule of activities and consultations. A lot of those were clickable because the takeaways were there. It is very important that that be made available again on the website because the whole point of that is so the whole community at any time can go on and say who said what, what was actually demanded in what ways this plan actually reflect the process. It is true that some sections of the plan have used that material in footnotes and documentation but those are just footnotes that often contain links that go back to those documents so people can actually check and see who said that and in what context. Not many people are going to want to do that, it is technically possible to make the materials available, and keep it available. There is nothing to be gained by deleting it from the website. It is one of the strongest things about the planning process.

In his view, this is the only academic plan process that has been conducted in such an open transparent and interactive basis. He thinks that we are stumbling now as we try to reach a comprehensive sort of global plan for the University. With an interactive website such as this, you can actually do one offs; you can do one year and you could plan for teaching of writing another year you can plan for what are we going to do with internet or online learning. Keeping the website, as it was, is critical.

L. Long (Undergraduate Trustee and Senate Observer) commented on the recommendations dealing with academic literacy. She expressed her appreciation for how much focus the plan has devoted to the topic because it is such a critical issue. Students are not coming to university well prepared to learn. She spoke in support of a UNIV100 first year course that would encompass an interdisciplinary curriculum, be seminar focused, with a pass and fail grading system. Another

their recommendation for more undergraduate tutors and TAs could potentially have an impact on graduate student funding and teaching employment at current enrolment levels.

P. Taylor commented that, in the sciences, there is no shortage of work for graduate students. Graduate students all have full TAs but more are needed. Undergraduate students are a wonderful resource, but one has to be careful. M. Jones made this point during APTF discussions. To put undergraduate students in positions of teaching has to contribute notably to their learning. Whether there is a problem in some disciplines about undergraduate TAs taking TAships away from graduate students should be explored.  
Senator Brouwer, Vice-Provost and Dean, SGS,

M. Jones spoke to his dissenting view, saying that his sense was that the plan was not ready to come forward yet. He did not think that any individual was at fault: the APTF is very small task force. Over the summer, membership became reduced. After he had left, about half the writing was done in a couple of months. In his view, this was just too short a time to put together something that would be worthy of being called the academic plan for Queen's University. He urged Senate to give more time to the project and maybe to replace members with others interested in these issues, capable of writing and who want to participate. He would have continued, but he had his other research to do. Senate should really think seriously about staffing the committee, giving it the resources it needs, and giving it the time it needs to do this right.

P. Taylor thanked everyone for the discussion. He invited further comments to be submitted to the website.

**4. Academic Development** (Appendix H, page 24)

- a) 2010 IB (Ôê). ú B é. MN ç đ Ę P, à À & U à À \ e0 " IM À d ð ` L Ü %]( 5p vi



**on October 6, 2011 without concern for academic repercussion. Alternate arrangements would include but not be limited to the rescheduling of examinations, extending the deadlines for submission of assignments and providing reasonable access to materials covered during lectures for students who require a three hour absence from classes on that day to vote.**

**Carried 11-59**

**2. Concerning the official grading system of Queen's University - Notice of Motion**

The Chair drew attention to the Notice of Motion in Appendix L, page 43 and noted that it would be presented to Senate at the next meeting on October 24, 2011.

**VI COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS SUBMITTED TO SENATE** (Appendix M, page 55)

**1. Research Report**

There were no questions or comments.

**2. Request to extend provisional status of the Sustainable Bioeconomy Centre**

There were no questions or comments.

**VII MATTERS REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEES**

None received

**VIII OTHER BUSINESS**

None received

Senate moved into Closed Session. Principal Woolf instructed all non-Senators to leave the room.

**IX CLOSED SESSION – CONFIDENTIAL** (Appendix N, page 56)

**1. Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee**

**Moved by Senator Flanagan, seconded by Senator Dickey Young, that Senate approve the list of those to be invited to receive honorary degrees at the Spring and Fall Convocations in 2012 in Appendix N, page 56.**

**Carried 11-60**

The Principal reminded senators that the list of nominees and alternates is strictly confidential until all invitees have replied and an announcement made in open session. About half of the convocation