



---

A meeting of the Senate was held on Thursday, January 28, 2010 in Robert Sutherland Hall, Room 202 at 3:30 p.m.

---

**Present:** Principal Woolf in the Chair. **Senators:** Archibald, Bae, Bakar, Bevan, Blennerhassett, Boag, Brien, Ceci, Chaudhry, Colgan, Colwell, Cordy, Culham, De Souza, Deakin, Dimitrov, Eubank, Fulford, Goodspeed, LaFleche, Laker, Lin, MacLean, McCormack, Medves, Murphy, Oosthuizen, Td{LnTcd(o),h Td}4(ec1)4(TdT,3y)-2(4(o)-ud)g3,TthyTdhy8rmit,

B. Griffiths, D. Janiec, A. Lawrence, L. Leal Conrad, G. Lessard, S. Marlin, J. Pierce, V. Remenda, S. Rigden, H. Smith, B. Walker, P. Young,

Preliminary Proceedings: Principal Woolf presented the *T. Geoffrey Flynn Advancement Champion Award* to A. MacLean, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science.

## I OPENING SESSION

The Chair welcomed new Senators K. Eubank and E. De Souza.

### 1. Adoption of Agenda

~~Moved by Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator Medves that the agenda be adopted as an honorary degree.~~

Carried 10-01

### 2. Adoption of the Minutes of the Meeting of 26 November 2009 (Appendix A, page 1)

Moved by Senator Oosthuizen, seconded by Senator Welsh that the minutes of November 26, 2009 be adopted as circulated.

Carried 10-02

### 3. Business Arising from the Minutes

None

### 4. Chair's Report

#### Academic Planning Process

Principal Woolf noted that his recently released vision statement, "*Where Next? Toward a University Academic Plan*" is on the Principal's website, [www.queensu.ca/principal](http://www.queensu.ca/principal). Faculties and departments are working on their plans. The Deans' deadline is April 15. A non-academic template will be ready shortly. The Principal will appoint a small group of academics to synthesize the documents into one draft academic plan over the summer. The University community and Senate will review the draft this fall before it is delivered to the Board of Trustees for its approval at the December 2010 meeting.

**Good-news stories**

**Gaels win Vanier Cup:** The Gaels are the best team in Canadian University football, having defeated the University of Calgary Dinos 33-31 in Quebec City on November 28. It is Queen's first Vanier Cup since 1992.

**Queen's Centre:** The facility opened December 1 2009 and includes student life, club space and athletics facilities. The new Common Ground student-run coffee shop is twice the size and the fully-functioning food court includes Teriyaki Experience, Booster Juice, Ignite Grill, Pizza Pizza and a full-service Tim Hortons. Nearly 10,000 people visited the Athletics and Recreation Centre (ARC) on the first day and more than 14,000 maps were distributed to visitors. The official opening took place January 15, 2010.

**TVO's Best Lecturer finals**

- b) **Board of Trustees Meeting, December 4-5, 2009** (Appendix C, page 14)  
There were no questions or comments.
- c) **International Centre – Annual Report 2008**  
There were no questions or comments.
- d) **Coordinator of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms – Annual Report 2008-2009** (Appendix D, page 16)  
Coordinator of Dispute Resolution Mechanisms H. Smith thanked faculty and student senators who gave their time to serve as members of the University Student Appeal Board (USAB) over the past year. He invited faculty senators and their colleagues interested in acting as dispute resolution advisors to contact him. Essentially, advisors volunteer to assist students with academic issues such as appeals. In response to Senator Stevens who asked if a breakdown of the types of issues addressed in the report could be provided, Mr. Smith replied he would consider creating some additional categories for the upcoming year.
- e) **Exit Poll 2009 – Results** <http://www.queensu.ca/registrar/aboutus/reports/exitpoll.html>  
University Registrar J.-A. Brady noted that this year's exit poll will be sent to graduating students in March. She noted a slight reduction in response rates last year. This year, the Office of the University Registrar will increase communication efforts and possibly incentives to encourage graduating students to complete the poll. She asked students at the meeting to spread the word amongst their classmates. The poll is used, and influences planning and decisions at the university. In a response to Senator Reid as to whether the report can be used on an ongoing basis for continuous improvement, J.-A. Brady replied that the deans receive the report. Faculties and departments have access to the underlying data specific to their areas. Ad-hoc comments that students make in the survey are also distributed to the deans. An ongoing response about students' low satisfaction about our physical and health education facilities was part of the rationale supporting the investment to construct the Queen's Centre.  
In response to a question from Senator Bae, J.-A. Brady replied that School of Medicine students no longer participate in this survey. Their students complete another graduate survey, which contains more detail about the curriculum and also several questions that mirror those in the Exit Poll. There were concerns about cannibalization of the response rates if students were asked to complete both. Senator Stevens asked about low satisfaction rates for services for international students and wide fluctuations between satisfaction rates between 2002-2009. J.-A. Brady replied that specific questions about services should be posed to the Director of Queen's University International Centre. She noted, however, that the number of respondents was higher than the number of international and exchange students on campus, indicating other students make use of services supporting internationalization.
- f) **Report on the Annual Budget 2009-10**  
[http://www.queensu.ca/financialservices/reports/budget/ROAB\\_09-10.pdf](http://www.queensu.ca/financialservices/reports/budget/ROAB_09-10.pdf)  
The Chair introduced new Vice-Principal (Finance and Administration) C. Davis, who attended Senate to speak to the report. There were no questions or concerns.

## I QUESTION PERIOD (Appendix E, page 23)

### 1.

place and appointments are being converted. She knew of no staff changes that have taken place related to graduate programs. In the planning of budget cycles, if reductions were to occur, the university would deal with it in the same way it would with any programs where resources are stretched. The Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) requires cyclical seven-year reviews of all graduate programs. These require extensive reporting on staff and faculty support as part of the peer-review process. The School has not received any reports for programs under review indicating staff-support issues. New programs have to be clear on what staff support is required to undertake the program, or the OCGS would not approve them.

### **III REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

#### **1. Advisory Research (Appendix F, page 25)**

1. **“Where next? Toward a University Academic Plan”, January 15, 2010, Daniel Woolf, Principal and Vice-Chancellor  
Moved by Senator LaFleche, seconded by Senator Deakin, that the Principal’s vision document be considered in an informal session chaired by Senator Stairs.**

**Carried 10-04**

Senator Stairs noted that one hour was set aside for senators to discuss the Principal’s vision document, “Where Next? Toward a University Academic Plan” of January 15, 2010.

The Principal described the document as a beginning point to guide discussions over the next few months and not to predetermine their outcome. He noted it would be useful to have an early discussion of ideas by the Senate.

Senator Stairs invited observers and guests to join senators to number off into six groups to discuss the following topics for 25 minutes.

1. **Four Fundamental Principles (page 4 of the report). Groups 1 and 2**
2. **Ten Proposals for Consideration (page 7) Groups 3 and 4**
3. **Some Possible Institutional Priorities (page 16) Groups 5 and 6.**

A notetaker-reporter from each group delivered a brief report.

**Group 1: Senator Wiener Four Fundamental Principles (page 4)**

- Flexibility should be included in the innovation principle. Barriers often exist that prevent change from taking place.
- Whether the term “quality” should be noted separately from the first principle or threaded throughout the document as something implicit to Queen’s.
- More emphasis on some principles over others. For example, with internationalism, Queen’s does not have the reputation outside the province that some other educational institutions do.
- The possibility of adding a fifth principle. While the four principles are strong, group members said there should be more emphasis on people and suggested adding a principle dealing with groups that make up the Queen’s community – undergraduate and graduate students, staff, faculty and administration. This is especially important when dealing with changes that could lead to less-conventional ways of teaching, learning and research that could cause a loss of connections between the various groups that create community. It is more than just a balance between education and research. There is something unique to Queen’s that we should preserve going forward over the next five to 10 years.
- The concern that change might lead to a complete loss of some of the departments or things Queen’s does right now, when trying to do less with less.

**Group 2: Senator Brien. Four Fundamental Principles (page 4)**

- There must be a balance between research and teaching, especially for our undergraduates. The double helix is an example. Research and teaching need to be intertwined. There should be no silos. The balance is needed to fully engage students in their education. Students should

and Technology Strategy. The university should optimize the use of those funding dollars along with the teaching expertise we have in our community to strengthen the interaction between research and teaching for all of our students.

- The need for openness in the academic enterprise, to be transparent and accountable in everything that we do, including innovation. To strive to be innovative, but also to recognize what's working and what isn't.
- The move beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries to develop interdisciplinary programs. We are already doing it in many of our professional schools, including the schools of Medicine and Nursing. Neuroscience program interacts across the university. We would be wise to promote interfaculty dialogue. We are moving in the right direction but we need to recognize that what works in one academic unit may not in another.
- The need to reach beyond our borders by bringing learners to Queen's and taking our researchers on the road. We have a responsibility to interact with the community.

### **Group 3: Senator Welsh. Ten Proposals for Consideration (page 7)**

The group covered seven of the 10 proposals.

- The option of students receiving additional credit for an increased amount of work is a good idea, but the group noted that it might work better in a major-minor situation instead of specialized programs. Would departments have the discretion to make the decision or to limit it.
- Interdisciplinarity: theoretically, it is a great idea but it is actually a nightmare to implement. The group considered individual departments whose source of strength is their independence. Piloting is wise and we might be prudent to do it, rather than implementing interdisciplinarity permanently.
- Virtualization – not a panacea. Some professors good at this but others are not. We should not lose sight of the reason we have a campus. If universities such as Athabasca represent best practice, then why should we do it? Varying the teaching methods may allow students who have different learning styles to improve. A new, large lecture theatre could draw big-name guests, but there was a concern that the teaching quality could be diluted if the lecture theatre is so big.
- Field trips are great idea but– too expensive? Access is a concern, since students have to self fund these trips. Improvements would include matching student funding. Group in favour of a “pedagogical agnosticism.” Costs are always a concern, particularly in specialized classes.
- Research excellence: the group was hoping for more details on the selection process because it could be divisive otherwise.
- Connecting teaching with research: How to persuade instructors and researchers and also the government that teaching also matters.

### **Group 4: Senator Chaudhry. Ten Proposals for Consideration (page 7)**

Group members discussed Point 1 and then counted down from 10 down.

- Degree structure: Agreed with Group 3 that it should be fluid. They suggested the Applied Science method of “bean counting” as a good example. The method of “stacking” credits needs to be made clear.
- Reaching beyond Kingston – money aspect is an

goal. In international initiatives you should have less-defined expectations, then you end up receiving more. This is part of the reason why you go somewhere is to learn about other people's cultures.

- Social spaces and conversations. QShare is an important example. Examples of good physical spaces include Grad Club and University club. Everyone seems to have a good time how can we further this at other areas in the university. How can we develop positive physical space on campus? We have to be flexible with campus space and maximize it.
- The university seems to close down between May and August. We could make better use of campus facilities during that time. Promoting more advanced degree programs and more summer schools should be considered.
- Subtle differences are often the source of strength for faculties.

**Group 5: Senator Bakar. Some Possible Institutional Priorities (page 16)**

- International development: Queen's is in a position to set itself as a global leader. While