

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee held on 6 December 2001, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in Room 609 of the James Administration Building.

Present: L.Vinet (Committee Chair), P. Bélanger, J. Bilec, C. Bushnell, M. Crago,
G. P. Demopoulos, M. Graham, W. Hendershot, N. Kasirer, H. Knox,
J. Paquette, F. Sagel, C. Straehle, H.M.C. Richard (Secretary of the Committee)
Guests: J. Henry (for item 5)
Regrets: E. Cooper, D. Crowley, P. Depalle, H. Goad, F. Groen, A. Grover, A. Lau,
A. Masi,

Document circulated at the meeting:

- 01-APPC-12-18 Motion from VP Bélanger on the naming of programs, Nov. 28, 2001

The Chair welcomed two new members: Professor George P. Demopoulos from the Department of Mining, Metals and Materials Engineering and Professor Hank Knox from the Department of Performance, Faculty of Music.

04.01 Agenda. Adopted as proposed.

04.02 **The minutes of the meeting held on October 25, 2001** were approved as circulated.

04.03 Business Arising

- a) New criteria and procedures for the Dean's Honours List (*01-APPC-10-11*)

A consultation with Deans on the proposal will take place on December 19, 2001. Point 4 of the Procedures will make it clear that the DHL designation cannot be appealed because it is an award, not a mark, and awards are not subject to appeal at McGill. The language of the text should be recast along that basis before the proposal is submitted to the Deans.

- b) Naming of programs (*01-APPC-10-13, 01-APPC-12-18*)

Vice-Principal Bélanger reported that Vice-Principal Drummond was informed of the points raised by APPC at its meeting on October 25 and would be satisfied with a simple recommendation to Senate which would allow him the necessary flexibility and serve his purpose. Dr Bélanger therefore circulated document 01-APPC-12-18 in which he moved that "The University include academic entities, such as: faculties, schools, centers, institutes and programs, in the list of items that may be named after a donor." **The motion was approved unanimously and will be submitted to Senate, together with the report.**

04.04 **Report on items submitted to Senate (337th/338th Reports)** - Memorandum from the Secretary-General, November 20, 2001 and excerpt from Minutes of Senate meeting held on Nov 7, 2001 (*01-APPC-12-16*)

- a) Model Research Progress Report Form for Graduate Students (*01-APPC-09-02 revised*)

The questions raised by Senate and recorded in the Minutes of Senate had to do with who would administer the forms, where they would be stored, whether a student who had been successful in the coursework but failed the research component would be required to withdraw, how many failures were permitted, and whether the form applied to non-thesis programs. More importantly, the point was made by Dean Shore that the research progress report should be a matter of policy rather than form (a form would need to return to Senate every time it required modification) and should therefore be formulated as a policy. Associate Vice-Principal Crago reported that graduate students also had expressed unsettled feelings that the proposed form was really a negative cast on progress; objectives should be risen above a record of progress. Given the confusion, it would be good to spend more time on this issue. Professor Crago proposed mandating a small working group comprised of four graduate students keen on being involved, Dean of Students Bruce Shore, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts Phil Oxhorn, plus perhaps two members from Social Science disciplines and Medicine. Besides drawing a policy, the working group would work through the minimum requirement form one more time. Vice-Principal Vinet made it clear that the form applies only to graduate students in research degree programs. Professor Demopoulos mentioned cases where students may make good progress reports but whose thesis may fail. Associate

Vice-Principal Crago responded that research progress assessment does not impact on the thesis but serves to have professors and students agree on goals, keep activity rolling, and document performance and progress. It was noted that other means exist to check on students' progress, such as a formal presentation to a committee once a year which provides feedback from more people than just the adviser. **The proposed working group was agreed to**, with Professor Kasirer and Professor Demopoulos joining the working group.

- b) Motion to extend eligibility for the Principal's Prize for Excellence in Teaching to GFT-H staff
(01-APPC-10-05)

Vice-Principal Vinet reported that the motion to extend eligibility for the Principal's Prize for Excellence in Teaching to GFT-H staff had been defeated in Senate on the grounds that it was strange to include Geographical Full-Time-Hospital staff (clinicians who are involved in teaching but draw most of their salaries from their practice) and exclude other categories of non-salaried academic staff, such as adjunct professors. GFT-H are not the only ones who teach at McGill in a practical teaching capacity. While adjunct professors contribute more on a voluntary basis, GFT-Hs have an affiliation to the hospitals and a supervisory function, and anything we do to have them recognized would be a positive thing. Vice-Principal Vinet invited APPC members to think about the issue before it is brought back for discussion.

- c) Name change of the Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering *(01-APPC-10-06)*

The motion to approve the proposed name change for the Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering to Department of Biosystems Engineering was referred back to APPC for consultation with departments. The faculties were consulted through associate deans, some of whom responded by voicing their personal opinion. Associate Vice-Principal Crago suggested that APPC should pay attention to the level of consultation carried out; faculties may be consulted through their Deans but departments might not hear about the proposal at all; departmental consultations could be suggested. Vice-Principal Vinet responded that Deans should be consulted about such proposals but it should be made very clear to them that they are being asked to consult their departments and that department Chairs are expected to consult their departmental members. In this case, **the request should again be put through by the Chair of the Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering to the relevant Deans with a specific request that they pass it on to specific departments**.

Change of degree names should also be considered at the same time as a Faculty submits a proposal to change the name of a department (degree name changes are submitted to SCTP while department name changes are submitted to APPC directly). This also applies to the Department of Physical Education and Kinesiology and to the Department of Mining, Metals and Materials Engineering. The Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences may also need to inquire from the accreditation board about further impact of the name change.

APPC will await the results of further consultation by the Department regarding proposed name change.

- d) Program nomenclature: "major" and "major concentration"

Vice-Principal Vinet stated that at the Senate meeting on October 10, 2001, when the 337th APPC Report was presented, the item on Program Nomenclature: "Major" and "Major Concentration" was withdrawn, so that the matter could be discussed at the Faculty of Arts Council and so that Senate could have the benefit of that input.

04.05 **Proposed Centre for Research on Pain *(01-APPC-12-14)***

Dr. James Henry presented the proposal for the creation of a Centre for Research on Pain. The proposal, which involves Dr. Bushnell was initiated by Dr. Yves de Kooninck who has now left McGill, and has evolved over the past several years. It seeks to capitalize on winds blowing strongly in favour of pain research. It aims to optimize opportunities for collaboration and put McGill in a competitive position to

be a national and international leader in the field. Dr. Bushnell added that many pain researchers cross a number of faculties and departments and that McGill has the largest concentration of pain researchers in the world. The plan is to strengthen clinical research and link eight universities across Canada. Pain research has been included as a priority area in McGill's strategic plan.

Vice-Principal Vinet invited the proposers to identify better what **added value** the creation of the centre would bring. In terms of relationship with the McGill-M.U.H.C. Pain Centre, why should yet another structure be put in place? Might it not confuse the organization of pain research even more. Dr Henry responded that the proposed Centre for Research on Pain will bring together researchers and promote clinical research. While there will be overlap between the McGill-M.U.H.C. Pain Centre and the new Centre, the ultimate vision is to merge. The Pain Centre group would form an integral part of the new Centre which would be the formal University Centre. All confusion will be removed eventually; the pain research activity at the M.U.H.C. will be an integral part of the new Centre and one division of it. There is no competition. It was suggested that **this vision should be made explicit in the mission statement**; a short paragraph should be integrated to the effect that M.U.H.C. Pain Centre activities will be part of the proposed new Centre. Associate Vice-Principal Crago also advised that the proposers should do their utmost to clarify the proposal and show how all pieces fit together and relate with one another.

The second issue raised was that of **governance**. Vice-Principal Vinet stated that the University was now in the process of working out standardized guidelines for centres, in consultation with the Deans. Once approved, these guidelines would provide general principles of governance, such as how to appoint a director, board members, how to phase out centers, who should chair the board, who should the centre report to, how much the Deans should be involved etc. Associate Vice-Principal Crago felt it was important the research centers have a structure which involves students, for centre can become a rich part of what graduate studies at McGill are about.

Professor Demopoulos then raised the issue of **physical space** in relation to educating graduate students. The document states that "the Centre will be virtual until an appropriate location is found." The proposers were being cautious. Though in the current plans for the Life Science Building no space for research on pain has been included, it is hoped that a few floors could be added, and when the M.U.H.C. moves into its new premises, use could be made of the real-estate surplus. Ideally, basic and clinical research should be under the same roof. The question seemed difficult to answer at this point but it was made clear that in order to be effective a centre required physical space. Vice-Principal Vinet indicated that the issue of physical space, in terms of square footage and kind of space, should be addressed clearly if pain research is to be a strategic area for the University. Deans have been instructed to include planning of centres (hires, space needs...) in their budget plans.

The impact of the proposed Centre on **undergraduate teaching** was also considered. At the moment, a number of courses on pain are taught but Dr. Henry noted that teaching on pain was currently grossly neglected in the training of medical students. By creating the Centre and emphasizing the importance of addressing the issue of pain, Centre members will be in a more credible position of strength for presenting arguments and convincing curriculum committees to give pain a larger place on the agenda.

Responding to Professor Kasirer's remarks that the proposal was obviously compelling but had a prospective kind of feel, Dr Henry spoke of the bright future he sees ahead for the Centre, on the basis of the number of initiatives which have been taken to change the Canadian health system in the field of pain. A large part of the initiation is to qualify for research funding and with it, continue what is being done and do more of it. He mentioned linking up with the Centre of Pain at the University of Toronto. Both Associate Vice-Principal Crago and Vice-Principal Vinet wished to know the extent of existing research

collaboration among researchers currently in place and how much would mean bringing people from elsewhere. Dr Henry responded that this was an evolving process, collaboration was being strongly encouraged and that he himself was collaborating with ten people on the list, plus three others and was trying to lead by example. The new Centre will encourage more people to work together. Vice-Principal Vinet advised that the push for a non-virtual centre should be very strong. Professor Kasirer, though sympathetic to the project, further remarked that there was relatively little text in the document devoted to describing the synergy. He wished the proposal to be a little more explicit on the idea that the Centre will be bringing the actors together and connect them more strongly. Though there may be an advocacy role to play in establishing the discipline, he advised that the document should make a case for the creation of a

centre rather than for the discipline. Vice-Principal Vinet suggested that the proposal should explain how McGill's pain researchers will be organized, what the major research axes will be, how they will evolve and relate. Vice-Principal Bélanger further suggested that the proposal should state which ones among the researchers spend most of their time on pain research, and what it is they do in pain research, so that the reader understands what the research is about. Associate Vice-Principal Crago added that the proposal should elaborate on the collaboration aspect, ie. who collaborates on what, and what collaboration will be added if, as Dr Henry stated, silos of pain research are broken down.

Professor Demopoulos suggested that organizing annual meetings to which researchers are invited can help create links and opportunities. Dr Bushnell mentioned the annual McGill Pain Day, invited speakers, workshops, Journal Club, public lectures. Vice-Principal Bélanger noted that the proposal may not do full justice to what is being done and is not as clear as it could be.

Funding was also discussed. Dr Henry was confident about the new Centre's ability to raise funds; it will position pain researchers so as to maximize opportunities, by enabling them to work through networks. Professor Graham was concerned about **integrity**, i.e. ensuring that source of funding for pharmaceutical research does not end up shaping research. Both Dr Bushnell and Dr Henry were confident that pharmaceutical companies could not shape the outcome of research as the companies do not have a veto on publishing the results of the research and do not have the rights to publish.

Vice-Principal Vinet concluded the discussion but suggesting that the proposal be reshaped, and that all the missing elements be part of the body of the text, not in an appendix. **Vote on the proposal was deferred until a new document is presented to APPC.**

04.06 Inter-University Master's program in Aerospace Engineering (01-APPC-12-17)

The Avis of CREPUQ's Comité d'évaluation des projets de programmes (CEP) pertains to the proposal submitted by the Ecole de technologie supérieure (ETS) of Université du Québec to join McGill University, Ecole Polytechnique, Concordia University, Université de Sherbrooke, and Université Laval in offering the Inter-University Master's program in Aerospace Engineering in collaboration with the aerospace industry in Quebec. Though it can be assumed that the participating universities and the industrial partners have given their consent to the proposal, APPC was not entirely comfortable with a suggestion included by the CEP in the text preceding its recommendation, that the responsibility for conducting this inter-university program's cyclical reviews should be part of the mandate of the Comité interuniversitaire du génie aérospatial (CIGA). Though this is but a suggestion, not a recommendation, APPC felt the need to react. McGill's representative on CIGA/CIMGAS will be consulted on the reactions of the other universities involved in offering the program.

04.07 Report from the APPC Subcommittee on Courses and Teaching Programs (meeting of November 1, 2001) (01-APPC-12-15)

Professor Hendershot presented the following four new program options proposed by the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences:

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences; Ecological Agriculture (90 cr.)

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences; General (90 cr.)

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences; International Agriculture (90 cr.)

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences; Soil Science (90 cr.)

and the following four new Major Internship programs:

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences Internship; Ecological Agriculture (102 cr.)

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences Internship; General (102 cr.)

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences Internship; International Agriculture (102 cr.)

B.Sc.(Agr.); Major in Agricultural Sciences Internship; Soil Science (102 cr.).

Those internships, of a minimum 12-week duration, are a credited activity for which government funds can be obtained. Marking covers a number of activities: letter of introduction, C.V., report on what students did, and oral presentation. **All eight programs were approved.**

04.08 Other business

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

