

Motion for Approval of the Completion of the 2010-11 Academic Planning Cycle, and for
the Institution of a Cyclical Annual Planning Process

by Jordan Morelli
(Queen's Senator for Physics, Engineering Physics and Astronomy)

Submitted as Notice of Motion on October 24 for action by the Senate
on November 22, 2011.

Given the objections to the draft plan as presented to FAS Faculty Board and Senate in
September (see comments on [the APTF website](#) and [in Senate](#));

given that the objections are to material that was added to complete the plan on a rushed deadline
after July;

given that as of late July the APTF had substantially completed drafts of several sections,
sections that are demonstrably built upon and extensively reference both its consultations and the
early unit reports;

given that these earlier sections fulfill the mandate of the APTF, which ~~was to~~ consult broadly on
"specific key issues" and use those consultations to "inform the drafting of the corresponding
section[s] of the plan" (Senate [minutes](#), 25 Nov. 2010, p. 8);

and given the 14th of the APTF's own "Guiding Principles" that "Planning cannot be ~~an one-~~
event. The University must continuously adapt to changing circumstances. We view the
creation of this Academic Plan as one phase in ~~an ongoing~~ cycle";

I move that Senate strike a compromise:

- namely, that Senate reject the draft currently proposed by the APTF; and
- that Senate consider separately, and approve where it deems appropriate, those draft sections
(most of which were included in the September draft) that were completed earlier in the year
and that make documented reference to the consultative basis (unit responses, APTF
consultations, and other expressions of the will of the community), specifically:
 - x Guiding Principles
 - x Pillar I:
 - ' "Developing Communication Skills and Fostering Students as Writers"
 - ' "On Virtualization, Blended Learning, On-line Learning, and the 'Greater
Differentiation' of Ontario Universities"

- x Pillar II: “Disciplinarity and Interdisciplinarity”
- x Pillar III: “Reaching Beyond: Globalism, Diversity, and Inclusion at Queen’s”
- x Pillar IV: “The Importance of Non-Academic Staff”
- x Appendices:
 - ’ 1. Acronyms
 - ’ 2. Unit Responses
 - ’ 3. Consultations
 - ’ 4. Sources Cited
 - ’ 5. UUDLES and GDLES

- And further that Senate endorse the process by which these draft sections were prepared the process of targeted consultations, the posting of both consultative results and interim drafts on a transparent and interactive website, and the subsequent adjustment of drafts in keeping with community feedback; and
- rather than seek to approve a ~~one~~ ^{time} academic plan addressing the whole institution in all of its branches and aspects, that Senate take this opportunity to institute an ongoing, annual process in which Senate specifies each fall a new planning issue or set of issues and strikes a task force of community members who are qualified to consult and draft an academic planning section for those issues, using the process established by the APTF.

Rationale:

The essential problem is that it is unrealistic to expect ~~small~~ ^{special} committee to complete a full

problem. Universities are complex organisms composed of highly specialized sub-units, each of which has different needs and challenges, and each of which experiences even the common needs and challenges in ways special to itself. Moreover, universities don't stand still: they change every year in themselves, and in response to continual change in their conditions and personnel. For such organizations, the best way forward is not to seek to produce a global academic plan once every ten or twenty years, but instead to make academic planning an ongoing iterative process, a habit of the institution, and to target different pressing issues each year so that they can be addressed with the patience, the care, and the particularity they deserve. Instituting such a process at this point would enable Queen's Administration to declare the Academic Planning complete for this year's "cycle" and to boast, with thanks to its first Academic Planning Task Force, of having instituted the open, transparent, and genuinely consultative Academic Planning process that will sustain it in the years to come.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS – Submitted for action in Senate on November 22, 2011.

6. Motion to Approve the draft, “The Importance of Non-Academic Staff”

I move that Senate approve the draft, “The Importance of Non-Academic Staff” (<http://realacademicplanning.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/the-importance-of-non-academic-staff.pdf>) as part of “Pillar IV” for the 2010-11 Academic Planning Cycle.

7. Motion to Approve the Draft Appendices to the Academic Plan

I move that Senate approve as parts of the 2010-11 Academic Planning Cycle, the following appendices:

1. Acronyms (<http://realacademicplanning.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/appendix-1-acronyms.pdf>)
2. Unit Responses (<http://realacademicplanning.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/appendix-2-unit-responses.pdf>)
3. Consultations (<http://realacademicplanning.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/appendix-3-aptf-consultations.pdf>)
4. Sources Cited (<http://realacademicplanning.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/appendix-4-sources.pdf>)
5. UUDLES and GDLES (<http://realacademicplanning.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/appendix-5-uudles-and-gdles.pdf>)

Respectfully submitted,

J. Morelli