

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee held on 4 April 2002, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in Room 609 of the James Administration Building.

Present: L. Vinet (Chair), C. Bushnell, E. Cooper, M. Crago, P. Depalle, R. Eley, H. Goad, M. Graham, F. Groen, A. Grover, W. Hendershot, A. Lau, J. Paquette, C. Straehle, H.M.C. Richard (Secretary of the Committee)
Regrets: D. Crowley, G. Demopoulos, N. Kasirer, H. Knox, A. Masi, F. Sagel,
Guests: P. Bélanger (item 03), D. Lussier, M. Maguire (item 05)

08.01 Proposed agenda.

The proposed agenda was adopted.

08.02 The minutes of the meeting held on March 7, 2002 were approved with the addition of Professor Goad's name to the list of members present.

08.03 Supplementary Report to APPC on Naming Opportunities (naming of academic units and programs), March 27, 2002 (01-APPC-04-31)

Dr. Pierre Bélanger presented the document which was prepared in response to Senate's wish to have details regarding the implementation of APPC's motion *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*. Initially, a donor's proposal to have a name attached to an institute or program had prompted the University to address the need to develop a policy on the issue as to whether to name academic entities and programs after a donor.

Dr. Bélanger noted that the Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations) had advised that a clear distinction should be made between the decision as to which entities could be named, and the decision as to what name would be attached to an academic unit or program. He stated that both are Board prerogatives but Senate should have a right of advice on the first, though not on the second; the actual naming of units or programs was not in Senate's mandate, though the identification of units or programs that could be named was. The proposal leaves it to the Deans to decide which units or programs could benefit from a donor opportunity (Recommendation 1).

The second recommendation enshrines current practice (with respect to naming academic units and programs, as well as physical entities), i.e. that approval by all deans whose faculties are involved in entities to be named should be secured.

The third recommendation deals with the need for a periodic review of units (research centers, institutes or academic programs) that are created as a result of a gift from a donor or that are named after a donor. A clause for periodic review gives a signal to the donor that the University has to ascertain the continued relevance of a unit to the academic mission of the University. While the mere creation of a research centre follows academic process, this recommendation enshrines the review process.

The fourth recommendation, that "academic units should be named after individuals, and not after corporations", was suggested by the Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations). The Seagram Centre at the Sir Arthur Currie Gymnasium was cited as an example of a unit named after a corporation which no longer exists. Dr. Bélanger stated that academic units should not be given names of corporations; only names of individuals should be used.

The fifth recommendation deals with process for naming buildings and space within and outside buildings. Dr. Bélanger felt that it was incongruous to have a Toponymy Advisory Group as a subcommittee of a Senate Committee which then submits its naming recommendations to the Board of Governors. The document therefore proposes that if naming space is a Board matter, then such naming recommendations should come from a committee of the Board.

The last paragraph of the document deals with funding thresholds. The document suggests that it is not up to Senate to fix the funding level acceptable for naming proposals, but up to the Board of Governors, on the advice of the Fund Council. While there seem to be no guidelines for the naming of faculties, schools

and departments, it is suggested that precedents from other universities in North America provide some indication of what might be appropriate.

In the discussion, the need for strict guidelines and application thereof was noted. The case of the University Centre, which for a number of years has on public notices been referred to as “The Shatner Building” by students, without proper official University approval of that name, was cited as an example of the University’s inability to apply guidelines. The Toponymy guidelines clearly state that names for physical entities at McGill have traditionally been derived from patrons and donors, chancellors, principals, deans, chairs, professors, governors, former owners, occupants, and others, and broadly speaking from three general types: 1) benefactors of the University, 2) distinguished members of the University community, and 3) functional designations. For the naming of a physical entity after a donor, the guidelines specify that the generally accepted rule is that “in the case of a major building, a donor would be expected to contribute at least 50% of the cost not funded by the Province.” It was suggested that the guidelines for naming physical entities should be tightened in order to give the University the right to remove plaques wherever non-approved names are used (the guidelines used by the SCPD’s Toponymy Advisory Group do not include such a clause).

Other irregularities were pointed out: the “McGill Institute for the Study of Canada”, founded with a private donation, did not conform to the official McGill definition of an “institute” at the time it was named. An institute normally would have to show evidence of research equivalent to that of a research centre. This was not the case for the MISC at its inception. In addition the MISC does not offer graduate programs; it is in fact closer to the definition of a centre than an institute. This is an instance where private funding pressure has come to bear on institutional definitions and practices. It was suggested that it would be wise to have naming proposals reviewed by other levels than those proposed in the document (i.e. a three-member group and the Board of Governors). Committee members were concerned that Senate (or a standing committee of Senate) would not be part of the approval process for the naming of physical entities and academic entities. It was specified that the role of Senate would be to approve the Deans’ lists of units that would be considered appropriate for naming opportunities. No specific Senate committee would have say in the appropriateness of the names themselves. This would be the Board’s prerogative.

It was made clear that the purpose of naming was to honour the memory of particular individuals and their contributions to the life of the University, academic, social, or financial. Naming opportunities do not necessarily have to be associated with fund raising.

In response to concern about the possible implications of the proposed policy whereby potential donors would be warned about the need for periodic review of the named/funded unit or program, it was noted that the necessary justifications would be offered, such as: the University wants the unit to continue to be useful to the community and the purpose of a review is to make sure that the donor’s money is well spent. It could be decided that other opportunities should be sought. It was noted that the existence of the object of a donation cannot be guaranteed to last for ever. Latitude is acceptable provided assurance is given that the name will be maintained.

Recommendation 4 on excluding names of corporations was thought to be somewhat radical and raised questions. It was noted that the use by corporations of individuals’ names (Bell, Bombardier) might make the distinction difficult. It was argued that for academic units and programs, the use of such a person’s full name rather than the name of the corporation would eliminate any confusion. McGill currently has endowed Chairs and physical entities named after corporations.

It was suggested and agreed that private foundations should be included as naming possibilities; given their philanthropic mission it would be odd not to include them.

It was also noted that naming physical or academic entities after distinguished members of the McGill community in order to honour their contribution to the life of the University could in some instances take away opportunities for raising funding. It may however be difficult to convince the University community that money should dictate naming decisions.

It was further stated that Recommendation 5 (which infringes on matters relating to the mandate of another Senate committee and of its Toponymy Advisory Group and their relation to the Board of Governors) was an addition to the Workgroup’s report beyond what APPC was mandated to consider. Such matters as are raised in that Recommendation would have to be discussed by the parties concerned, Senate, and the Board of Governors.

Regarding the amount of money which would be considered sufficient for the naming of academic units and programs, it was reiterated that such guidelines would be set by the Fund Council and that discussions akin to those surrounding endowments of chairs could be anticipated. It was commented that in some instances (book endowments for example) it appears wise to be flexible and accept a lesser amount rather than insist on a threshold.

At the conclusion of the discussion **it was suggested and agreed that more consultation on the matter was required, in particular with such groups as the Principal/Vice-Principals (PVP) group and Deans.**

The Chair took this opportunity to express the Committee's gratitude to former Vice-Principal (Research) Pierre Bélanger and wish him well on his retirement from administrative duties at the University.

08.04 SCTP Report on meetings held on February 14 and 28, 2002 (01-APPC-04-29)

No items required APPC approval.

08.05 SCTP Report on meeting held on March 14, 2002 (01-APPC-04-30)

- B.Ed.; Joint-Inter Program in Français langue seconde [with Université de Montréal] (120 cr.)

Associate Dean Mary Maguire and Professor Denise Lussier presented the proposal. The two programs offered by McGill and Université de Montréal (UdeM) will gain in critical mass by being joined. The Comité d'Agrément des Programmes de Formation à l'Enseignement (CAPFE) is enthusiastic about this proposal. "Dummy courses" have been created by giving McGill numbers to courses offered at UdeM; this will make calculation of GPA, transcripts, and disciplinary matters conform to McGill's policies. Half of the courses will be taken at McGill. It was noted that the joint program is strongly supported by the faculties of Education of both universities. Two years of work on this program did much to bring the two university departments closer together. **Approved.**

- B.Sc.; Joint Honours in Physica and Chemistry (80 cr.)

The program will provide good training for students wanting to work in fields at the innovative crossroads of physical chemistry and physics. Several fall-back mechanisms are available to students unable to complete this intensive program. It was suggested and agreed that the description should be edited: in the second sentence, "with a theoretical bias" should be deleted. **Approved.**

The need for a revision to page 3 of the SCTP report was noted: the retirement of the B.Sc.;Minor in Music for Science Students should have as a heading "Faculty of Music / Faculty of Science", under Faculty of Music.

08.06 Other business

None.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.