Minutes
Meeting:
University Council on Anti-Racism and Equity (UCARE)
ʹ Public Meeting
Date & Time:
March 11, 2021
5:00-6:00 pm
Location: Zoom
Co-Chairs: Alana Butler and Aba Mortley
Members:
 Alana Butler (Elected – Faculty, Faculty of
Education)
 Yolande Chan (ex Officio – Provost’s Delegate)
 Yolande Davidson (Elected – Alumna and
Community Member)
 Petra Fachinger (ex Officio – Chair of SEEC)
 Janice Hill (ex Officio – AVP Indigenous Initiatives)
 Lavonne Hood (ex Officio – University
Ombudsperson)
 Richelle Ignatius (Elected – AMS Student)
 Klodiana Kolomitro (Elected – Faculty, Director of
Education Development and Adjunct Professor
with DBMS)

 Aba Mortley (Elected – Alumna and Community
Member)
 Mona Rahman (Elected – Staff, Office of the Vice-Principal Research)
 Angela Sahi (ex Officio – AMS Social Affairs
Commissioner)
 Teri Shearer (ex Officio – Principal’s Delegate)
 Stephanie Simpson (ex Officio – Associate Vice-Principal (Human Rights, Equity and Inclusion)
 Nathan Utioh (Elected – Staff, Residence Life)
 Leena Yahia (Elected – SGPS Student)

Regrets:  Laeeque Daneshmend (Elected – Faculty, Department of Mining Engineering)
 Fikir Haile (ex Officio – SGPS Equity and Diversity Commissioner
 Adriana Lopez Villalobos (Elected – Staff, Queen’s Biological Station)
 Ann Tierney (ex Officio – Vice-Provost & Dean Student Affairs)
 Osaru Omoruna (Elected – AMS Student)
Guests: Mark Green, Provost and Vice-Principal (Acad36.6 res13(s)5(
11
Q
q
112.94 288m32
q
112.94 288.53 470.14 36.6 re
W* n
BT
/F2 9.96 Tf
1 0 0 1 239.
1 0.A/F2 9.96

2. Student Code of Conduct
Aba welcomed Provost and Vice Principal (Academic) Mark Green, to speak to the Student Code of Conduct.
Mark Green thanked everyone for agreeing to this meeting. Mark reviewed the proposed amendments.

The proposed amendments to the Student Code of Conduct include:
 aligning the definitions of “harassment” and “discrimination” with those in the draft Harassment and
Discrimination Prevention and Response Policy
 the addition of educational commentary on discrimination and protected grounds under the Ontario
Human Rights Code. Again, this educational commentary is aligned with that being proposed in the
Harassment and Discrimination Prevention and Response Policy; and,
 additional language to make clear that violating protected grounds under the Human Rights Code is
considered as a factor in the sanctioning process.

Aba and Alana opened the floor for questions or concerns. Aba read a question she received in advance, from
Laeeque.

Question: “In the Principal’s statement of September 16, 2020 regarding COVID-19 and Queen’s Student Code
of Conduct, he indicated, in part, that students, whether living on or off campus, are expected to uphold public
health directives – and that students whose behaviours ignore provincial and other applicable regulations will
be referred for review under our Student Code of Conduct and will be subject to sanctions available under the
Code, including expulsion from the university.

Does this mean that the Student Code of Conduct can now be interpreted to encompass other off campus
behaviours that violate the Code, including acts of racism? Will the revised Student Code of Conduct reflect this
expansion of scope, as was recommended in the PICRDI report?”

Answer: Mark replied that determination of the SCC's scope revolves around how an activity affects operations
and the living/learning community. For example, just before Christmas there was a COVID 19 outbreak in the
student community, which meant we had to reduce operations for some units on campus. General off campus
activity needs to be assessed to see if it is in scope. In the case of COVID 19 we are able to demonstrate this
quickly and easily. Scope would need to be determined on a case by case basis.

Question: Petra Fachinger and Liz Brulé asked if there could be more extensive definitions for transphobia,
anti-Semitism and Islamophobia –similar to the definition of homophobia? Liz suggested reviewing the report
from Justice Cromwell as it provides robust definitions.

Answer: Mark asked Lindsay Winger to take this suggestion under advisement.

Question: Anita Davies asked, I notice that the amendments include a definition of "race" and "racism" which
is important; however, there is no definition of "institutional racism" or "Islamophobia" for example. Is there
room to add these or to discuss this further? I realize that everything can't be included.

Answer: Lisa Newton advised that we keep in mind that changes to the SCC are being undertaken in
conjunction with the new
new
un "race""4e
29.16 36.36 553.92553. 12 Tf
1 0 0 1 1614C q
29.1674.0s* n
6 36.36 553.920 1 34.2 F2 1p6e
W*"race""4e
29.16 36.36 5e
W* licyG
[( )] 7.13 99.024 Tm
0 g
0 G
[( )] TJ
ET65e
W* lic[(t)-4(o)7( )-3(t)5(h)-4(e)-5(S)9(C)3(C)] TJ
ET
Q
q
29.16 36.36 553.92 715race""4e
29.16 36.36 5y d

Question: Jubilee Lambie asked, outside of typical overt racism (e.g. derogatory name calling) when do more
subtle experiences of racism fall under the SCC?
Answer: Mark noted that it was important to prioritize the experience of the person affected and that, most of
all, students sh

more tangible actions in the form of better student experiences and just outcomes.
Question: Yolande Chan asked in respect to "student groups" under the SCC, are special interest groups
allowed (i.e. will they be permitted to restrict membership)?
Answer: Mona commented that her understanding was that a special interest group (under the Ontario
Human Rights Code) does have the right to restrict membership because otherwise it is no longer a special
interest. This special interest group is specifically catering to that group to allow them the privileges they
cannot get in the majority. It is in the Canadian' Charter or Ontario Human Rights code. It may be a good idea
to have that explicitly (i.e. special interest group rights) [stated] as this is an issue that comes up with a
misunderstanding on the part of student groups like the AMS.
Yolande Davidson commented that to help prevent conflation with discrimination, it would be helpful to be
more explicit on the special interest group issue. "Club" or "student society" may not immediately convey that
there are Charter provisions afforded to groups who choose to restrict membership and have the right to do
so.
Lon agreed that Ontario Human Rights Code provisions allow special interest organizations. Lon committed to
looking at whether/how this exception could be made more explicit in the SCC.
Question: Yolande Davidson and Leena asked, what recourse does a complainant have if they feel they haven't
been well served by the investigation/fact finding? People don't trust the institutional structures.
Answer: Mark and Lindsay commented that trust is very

student familiarity with the SCC and to build trust.
3. Other Business (5