

---

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> September 2002, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in the Arts Council Room (160) of the Arts Building.

Present: L.Vinet (Chair), C. Bushnell, E. Cooper, Ph. Depalle, M. Crago, G. Demopoulos, F. Groen, W. Hendershot, H. Knox, N. Peters, F. Sagel, H.M.C. Richard (Secretary of the Committee)

Regrets: J. Bilec, M. Graham, A. Lau, A. Masi, G. Philie, L. Proulx

Guests: M. Beaulieu, S. French (item 10), N. de Takacsy (item 9)

---

01.01 **The proposed agenda** was adopted

01.02 **Committee membership and meeting schedule for 2002-03**

It was reported that the Nominating Committee of Senate would be meeting in the following week to recommend replacements for the four vacant slots (one sabbatical and three expired terms). A graduate student would also be appointed shortly.

01.03 **The minutes of the meeting held on 16th May 2002** were approved as circulated.

01.04 **Business arising from the minutes**

Items arising from previous sets of minutes are being considered as separate items on the agenda: graduate students performance reports (meeting of May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2002<sup>1</sup>) and the Centre for Research on Pain (meeting of December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2001).

01.05 **Broad questions**

The Chair outlined the need for APPC to discuss questions of a broader nature and to report to Senate on them. He stated that he planned to include such issues in APPC's regular reports to Senate. He brought a number of points to the attention of APPC members. 1) At the summer Deans' Retreat (held on August 22<sup>nd</sup>-and 23<sup>rd</sup>) questions relating to such issues as graduate studies, program review, space considerations came to the fore and the need was felt to follow up with concrete proposals. Writing a follow-up version to the "Tradition and Innovation" planning document and proposing an implementation plan for the ideas put forward seemed essential. APPC members will, for example, be asked to contribute their views on how the University should be growing with respect to graduate studies. 2) The University is gearing up for a private funding campaign for which the target has been fixed at \$500 million to be divided up among faculties and central administrative services. Earlier in the year the deans have been invited to develop their list of priorities, which they are now being asked to revise in order to meet specific targets assigned to each faculty. Deans are expected to respond with their revised list by the end of September. These lists will be synthesized into a shorter document for submission to the Principal-Elect who will have to take ownership of the list, and the McGill Fund Council. In February 2003, APPC will be asked to review the list before it is submitted to Senate in March. 3) Faculty Reviews: the new Principal will ask that every time a dean leaves office a faculty review should be carried out. The selection process for deans of the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Arts may be delayed until such a procedure is put in place.

It was noted that the Deans' Retreat had also touched on the issue of the nature of master's programs, non-thesis vs applied and vs thesis master's, and whether to allow students to go straight to Ph.D. programs on the American model. Another issue was that of online distance education and the procedure for evaluating online programs. It was commented that this would make for a rich agenda for APPC and that in the past the APPC Subcommittee on Planning and Priorities had dealt with many such broad issues for APPC. While APPC deals with the regular business of the University it has little time for debating conceptual issues as mandated in its terms of reference; this may necessitate a different time management and perhaps the use of task forces.

---

01.06 **Centre for Research on Pain / Centre de recherche sur la douleur** - Revised proposal, May 15, 2002 (02-APPC-09-01)

It was recalled that an initial proposal was presented to APPC by Dr. Jim Henry on December 6, 2001. At that time, APPC had raised a number of questions and vote on the proposal had been deferred until a new

document could be presented. In particular the proposers were invited to identify more explicitly the added value the creation of the centre would bring and to make the vision more explicit in the mission statement; the issue of physical space also had to be addressed more clearly. Dr Bushnell presented the revised proposal, explaining that following Dr. Jim Henry's departure for the University of Western Ontario, she had been elected as interim director of the proposed centre. The revised document attempts to show research interactions and how the McGill initiative fits into the broader plan. Recently recruited researchers are strengthening an already strong pain research group and there is a desire among a number of researchers elsewhere to join McGill. Finding space for members of the group to come together seemed crucial.

In the discussion, it was noted that the first presentation of the proposal had emphasized the need for responding to funding opportunities. It was noted that the centre would be well positioned for seeking grants from government and private funding agencies and collaborating with the pharmaceutical industry. The proposed centre was also thought to be a perfect candidate for applying for CIHR training grants.

It was mentioned that normally curricula vitae are attached to proposals for the creation of research centres. Furthermore while axes are listed in the proposal, they are not described. It would be useful also to have an indication of what inter-axes and collaborations might be expected, it being understood that the situation is in evolution and future collaborations very much depend on the creation of a centre. There was a sense that the proposal falls short of showing what would make it exciting to be part of that centre from a research and academic stand point. For example, if the centre were to offer physical space, the proposal might expand on the advantages of having shared resources and having the centre built around shared core facilities such as animal and human testing facilities, and could elaborate on what it is hoped might happen in terms of collaborative work (such as clinical work on visceral pain) and on how shared facilities would facilitate collaboration. It was thought that the concept of building a centre around critical core research facilities did not come through in the proposal and should be stated more clearly. On the other hand, should space not become available, the more the researchers come together (be it for meetings and presentations, or to prepare this proposal, etc.), the more collaborative projects are generated. With reference to the amount of research activity already generated, it was suggested that, for readers' interest, the proposal could touch on the basic mechanisms, explain a little how they link from animal to human, and provide examples of possibilities that could be considered. With reference to library collections (last page), it was suggested that the proposers should state their needs and specifically what material should be made available.

There was consensus that the Chair should give another revised document expedited approval rather than have the proposal submitted to the Committee once again. It was noted that it will be useful to have the proposers go through the exercise of defining the elements found missing and that this should enable the proposal to move through Senate more smoothly. The Centre will have to find a way to present and project itself in an exciting way in order to generate funding. Reservations were however stated with respect to overplaying the space factor as putting all researchers together may not generate more research than having them meet once a week, and the centre may have to start with more modest means. Lastly it was suggested that an executive summary should be added. **A revised proposal will be submitted to Provost Vinet who will take it under advisement and bring it forward to Senate for approval.**

**01.07 Motion to modify composition of the Council of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies** by the addition of the Associate Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, with voice but no vote – memo from Martha Crago, May 24, 2002 (02-APPC-09-02)

Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Martha Crago presented the motion. The Executive Council of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies has recommended that the new Council should include the Associate Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies as an ex-officio member. That person has responsibility for disciplinary and student problems and "is consequently in an excellent position to identify shortcomings in existing policies and procedures" and would through that point of view "contribute meaningfully to the deliberations of Council." The proposal moved by Dr. Cooper seconded by Professor Hendershot was **approved unanimously**.

**01.08 Model Graduate Students' Research Progress Reports**

- Guidelines and Policies for Academic Units on Graduate student Advising and Supervision, June 19, 2002 (02-APPC-09-03)

*Forms:*

- Model Objectives Report Form,
- Model Graduate Student Progress Record, to be filled in by the student,

- Model Progress Report Form, to be completed by the supervisor and/or supervisory committee, June 19, 2002 (02-APPC-09-04)

Consideration of this item was postponed to the next meeting on September 26 when a graduate student will have been appointed to APPC. Although graduate students have already had considerable input into the proposed policy and model forms, it was agreed that discussion at APPC should be informed by the participation of its graduate student member.

#### 01.09 **Student Exchanges (02-APPC-09-05, 02-APPC-09-06)**

Associate Vice-Principal (Academic) de Takacsy presented two proposed student exchange agreements.

a) Multilateral exchange agreement: "Multi-Cultural Perspectives in Education", North American Mobility Project in Higher Education funded by HRDC - memo from N. de Takacsy, 09-07-2002 (02-APPC-09-05)  
**APPC approved in the name of Senate** McGill's participation in a multilateral exchange agreement for students focusing on multi-cultural perspectives in Education and linking McGill University, Simon Fraser University and the University of British Columbia in Canada, the University of California in Los Angeles, Arizona State University and the University of New Mexico in the United States, and the Universidad Pedagogica de México, and the Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos in Mexico.

b) Bilateral exchange agreement with the Universiteit van Amsterdam - memo from N. de Takacsy, 22-09-2002 (02-APPC-09-06)

It was noted that student mobility was a very popular issue in Europe nowadays; it is also easier to be "international" in Europe. Dutch universities are among the universities that find it easiest to take in international students because of so many languages being spoken there. The Universiteit van Amsterdam is largely a humanities and social sciences university and is recommended without any hesitation. In the discussion it was noted that Dutch university students are interested in coming here but few if any McGill students in Engineering and Science take part in such exchanges. No such difficulty regarding the ability of host institutions to accommodate exchange students is experienced in the Humanities and the Social Sciences. McGill's participation in a bilateral exchange agreement with the Universiteit van Amsterdam was **approved in the name of Senate**.

#### 01.10 **Subcommittee on Teaching Programs**

##### a) Report from the Chair of SCTP

Associate Vice-Principal (Teaching Programs) Martha Crago reported that the APPC Subcommittee on Teaching Programs may have the reputation of being a knit-picking group in its screening of courses and programs before they are submitted to APPC. In order to facilitate the revision process and make the work less onerous for faculties, SCTP is considering a switch to having proposals submitted electronically. Membership on the Subcommittee is for three-year terms. Current members include: Professors Martha Crago (Chair), Jim Brawer, Sam Drury, Jane Everett, William Hendershot, and Joan Russell, Ms Charlotte Légaré, students Vivian Choy (SSMU) and Alison Thorne (PGSS), and Cindy Smith as Secretary of the committee. SCTP is concerned about cleaning up the list of courses on McGill's books and routinely requests a list of courses and programs with no enrolment and the reasons for not retiring them. The Banner system allows a form of retirement that will not delete courses completely; they will just not appear in the calendar but will be kept in the "virtual attic". This will eliminate the practice of excessive "bulletting" of courses which presents a poor image of the University's offerings to students.

Professor Crago also mentioned the SCTL Working Group of online education to which APPC appointed one member and the follow-up to the reports of the Commission des universités sur les programmes now in the hands of a Comité de suivi sur les programmes with many subcommittees which are looking at the CUP recommendations. She suggested that APPC should be made aware of the work of those committees and proposed that **an English translation of the recommendations be presented to APPC**.

##### b) Report on meeting held on May 9 and May 23, 2002 (02-APPC-09-07)

Two new programs were considered.

- i) Certificate in Plastics Engineering (30 credits)

The Certificate program has been run at Université Laval successfully with the same set of courses as are included in the proposed program. McGill University was approached to collaborate with Laval and the Plastics Industry Association of Quebec in offering the Certificate aimed at meeting the increasing demands of the plastics industry in the Montreal area. The Centre for Continuing Education was felt to be the most suitable unit for administering the program. McGill will be collecting fees for this certificate program.

In the discussion, APPC noted the request by the Department of Chemical Engineering (memo from the Chair, Professor Richard Munz) "that the instructors and practical programs be approved by (the) Department." Regarding approval of courses by the Department, that request is in keeping with Continuing Education policy whereby courses offered by the Centre should receive endorsement by relevant academic departments in order to ensure that McGill standards are kept. It was noted that the Department would be a logical place to look for instructors for the proposed certificate, unless the instructors who taught in Montreal for Université Laval continue to do so. Some degree of interaction and consultation with the Department of Chemical Engineering should be assumed and expected. In conclusion it was agreed that a sentence should be added when the proposal is submitted to Senate, stating that "The Centre for Continuing Education will consult with the Department of Chemical Engineering concerning the instructors and course content." With this addition, the proposed Certificate program was **approved**.

ii)      B.N.; Integrated Nursing (66 credits)

Professors Susan French and Marcia Beaulieu from the School of Nursing joined the meeting. It was explained that the proposed program, on the MEQ's initiative, was a radical departure and a pragmatically important proposition in view of the need for more nurses and for providing them with more training. The five-year integrated, seamless program is comprised of three years at CEGEP and two years at McGill but will require that students be promoted into the university part of the program. This particular program was worked out with a set of English language CEGEPs. Similar programs have been developed in four other (French-language) consortia across the province. Students will not have the option of moving from one consortium program to another because of the way programs have been designed. The development of such five-year programs has involved a great number of meetings and is a remarkable undertaking. McGill will gain students from this program as until now students would go to Ontario after obtaining their CEGEP degree in order to complete their program with two years of University-level studies.

In the discussion, it was noted that particular questions such as automatic admission to the University section of the program and questions relating to stages (compensation, number of places) have not been completely solved. Professor French mentioned that the government had asked universities to report on those issues. McGill's University Admissions Committee was firm about the need for University autonomy to be exercised with respect to admission standards (70% minimum). While all universities share the same resistance to "automatic admission", French universities were making a quantitative argument, claiming space limitation. Both positions violate the spirit of "passage automatique" according to the Ministry of Education. No response from the MEQ has been received.

It was noted that 70 additional students may create a demand on space which should be of critical concern in the library as well. It was stated that three working groups had focused on admission, clinical stages, and curriculum. While attempts will be made to maximize the use of clinical spaces, the issue of library space still has to be considered. As for library resources per se, the answer may have to be a virtual one for now.

In response to other questions, Professor French and Professor Beaulieu stated that the School was confident that it could train nurses that would be as good as in the past, if not better. The School was now a lot more familiar with the CEGEP program than previously and was thus able to build a strong and better program. The School of Nursing has created a course in both Biology and Chemistry which is specific to nurses and will have a greater success rate than the previous courses which were considered to be too hard; a better fitted and focused course was necessary for a program that is shortened by one year.

Asked how diverse the programs in the five consortia across will be, Professor French stated that the CEGEP-level courses are given in a different sequence but students are supposed to have received equivalent training by the end of their collegial studies. Details of university portions are not known; credits vary. When designing its two-year portion of the program, McGill started with the B.N. rather than the B.Sc. It is difficult to assess whether differences among programs will be obvious, though students have to reach the same degree of competence at the end of their five-year program.

It was stated that in approving the proposed program McGill was also on record that it would not abandon

its autonomy with respect to admissions and would not accept automatic admission. It was suggested that McGill might consider offering a qualifying program for those students who would not meet the University's admission requirements.

**Approval** of the proposed program was unanimous.

**01.11 Other business**

None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.