
Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee held on 10th October 2002, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in Room 609, James (Administration) Building.

Present: L.Vinet (Chair), C. Bushnell, M. Crago, G. Demopoulos, Ph. Depalle, M. Graham, F. Groen, W. Hendershot, P. Martineau, G. Philie, L. Proulx, F. Sagel, H.M.C. Richard (Secretary of the Committee)
Regrets: J. Bilec, E. Cooper, H. Knox, A. Lau, A. Masi, N. Peters
Guests: M. Baldwin, I. Butler, L. McNeil (item 5)

03.01 The **proposed agenda** was adopted.

03.02 **The minutes of the meeting held on 26th September 2002** were approved with one correction ("McGill") on the first line of the first full paragraph on page 2 and one addition to the second paragraph under item 02.04, page 1 on the Teaching Portfolio guidelines. The paragraph should begin as follows: "It was suggested and agreed that the title should be changed from "Instructions" back to "Guidelines", that "It is expected that" should be deleted, and that all 'shall's should be changed to 'should's."

03.03 **Business arising from the minutes**

a) Centre for Research on Pain / Centre de recherche sur la douleur, (revised proposal)

It was reported that a revised version had been submitted to the Chair.

b) Teaching Portfolio: Teaching Portfolio guidelines appended to the "Regulations Relating to the Employment of Academic/Librarian Staff"

The corrections agreed to by APPC have been made and the revised document was sent to MAUT. With MAUT's agreement, the document has been included in APPC's 343rd Report to Senate for consideration by Senate on October 16.

c) Model Graduate Students' Progress Reports

More time is required for reworking the policy and forms.

03.04 **APPC Subcommittee on Courses and Teaching Programs:** report on meeting of September 19, 2002 (02-APPC-10-10) and additional report (02-APPC-10-13)

All items included in the two reports were for APPC's information and will be reported to Senate for information only.

03.05 **Research Policy Committee**

a) Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects (02-APPC-10-11)

Dr. Mark Baldwin (Department of Psychology), Associate Vice-Principal (Research) Ian Butler, and Ms Lynda McNeil, Research Ethics Officer (Non-medical Human Subjects) presented the proposed Policy. Dr Butler reminded the Committee that the Research Policy Committee was a subcommittee of APPC and therefore any new policy presented by the RPC required APPC's approval before being submitted to Senate. Dr Baldwin stated that there was no current policy or older version of the document to refer to. The challenge had been to formulate a common policy on the treatment of human subjects which would work for all and be sufficiently flexible; the proposed document had undergone a thorough consulting process and considerable review, by the University's Legal Services in particular. A new, approved text for section 4.2, resulting from the last round of revisions, was circulated to APPC.

On motion by Vice-Principal Louise Proulx, seconded by Professor Hendershot, the proposed Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects, including the new text for section 4.2, was **approved unanimously for submission to Senate**.

b) Guidelines for Research Centres (02-APPC-10-12)

Associate Vice-Principal (Research) Ian Butler presented the proposed guidelines, stating that McGill had a large number of centres of various sizes: some of those centres had gone through the University's

approval process while others were created without having been officially approved. The current "Guidelines and checklist for research centers" (circulated by e-mail to members) goes back to 1995. Provided all the points on the checklist have been addressed satisfactorily and official approval has been obtained, centre funding can be sought from external sources. The proposed "Criteria for Recognizing, Creating and Maintaining Research Centre Status", "Checklist for Creation of a Research Centre", and "Minimal By-Laws Required for the Operation of a Research Centre" would apply to McGill-based research centres only. Dr. Butler stated that much discussion had taken place regarding inter-university centres and that it was acknowledged that government structures would vary with each case. He pointed out that item 3 on inter-institutional connections and agreements on the "Checklist for Creation of a Research Centre" should be deleted as it could not constitute a requisite. Among the basic elements listed under "Minimal By-Laws Required for the Operation of a Research Centre" are: physical space, a management board, different types of members, a funding mechanism, an annual general meeting, submission of an annual report, and the possibility to dissolve the centre.

In the discussion, the need for the goals of the research centre to "clearly relate to the McGill strategic plan and be perceived to fulfill aspirations at the frontiers of knowledge in and between the disciplines covered" or better "to be fully integrated in the strategic development of the University" (first item under Criteria) was noted. Item 6 on page 2 was corrected to read: "A research centre cannot grant degrees or ~~sponsor~~ deliver graduate programs." "Inter-axes linkages" was added to item 8 of the Checklist. Regarding item 6, it was made clear that centres report to deans but some reported to the Vice-Principal (Research) as former Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. Administrative responsibility may rotate among the deans involved in an inter-faculty research centre. The Committee debated whether the Checklist should include a question as to whether members of the proposed centre had previously worked together. It was agreed that this could not be a pre-condition for establishing a centre; although prior history may be interesting to know it could be addressed differently. It was agreed that "plans for outreach (public at large, industrial links...) could be included under "Future development plans" (item 9) but should rather be addressed as an additional item, while inter-university collaboration could be addressed under item 8.

In discussing the "Minimal By-Laws", the Committee wondered about the physical location requirement. It was reminded that at its launching in May 2000 the Centre for Bioinformatics had no such physical location, though it now has. Dr. Butler stated his preference for a physical location (a site for a secretariat) before the creation of a centre could be approved; he felt that in order for a centre to be effective a physical space was required. It was noted that one point which may not be sufficiently clear was the importance for faculties involved to take ownership of their centres. While the space arbitrator is the University, deans are asked to take centres into consideration in their hiring plans and in their physical plans. It was pointed out that the University was short of research space and was considered to be over-spaced for classrooms (which does not mean that such space is necessarily well adapted). It was suggested that wording in the document should allow flexibility. Terms of appointment for centre directors were also discussed at length. It was noted that there was no uniform length of term across the University and that in terms of research development, a three-year period was short, though ten years could be considered extreme. It was agreed that while it would be necessary to include terms, it might be preferable to make three- or four-year terms renewable provided a light assessment process could be put in place. It was also felt that the expectations for full membership should be spelled out, i.e. a significant fraction of research should be done within that centre (it is not possible to be a full member of several centres) and one's research output should relate to that centre in applications for funding. Expectations for associate membership are lighter; participation as an associate member in the activities of the centre would not constitute a researcher's major effort.

Discussion also dealt with proposed Minimal By-law 8 on Research Funding Allocations: it was noted that each centre should have a transparent procedure. It may be necessary to add that "Allocations should be done in a transparent way". It was also suggested and agreed that By-law 7 on Membership in Research Centre should allow undergraduate students to be part of the list. The word "graduate" on the third line should therefore be deleted so that the sentence should read: "...Postdoctoral Scholar Member and Student Member."

The "Criteria" were further discussed. With respect to the second item relating to the governing board, it was made clear that the Dean should take on responsibility for centres and no replacement (an Associate Dean Research for example) should assume the chairmanship of the Board. After extensive discussion it was agreed that the language of the last sentence of Item 7 should state that "within a period not exceeding six years, the Vice-Principal (Research) or the Dean may request a review of the performance of the research centre." It was agreed that a six-year target was a reasonable time, given that annual reports

generated by the director and approved by the Board and submitted to the Vice-Principal (Research), annual Board meetings, as well as annual budget applications constitute adequate safeguard mechanisms.

It was agreed that **the document should be revised and resubmitted to APPC.**

03.06 **Broad questions**

a) Issues relating to Graduate Studies

This item will be placed at the top of the agenda for the meeting of APPC on 7th November 2002.

b) CREPUQ Comité de suivi sur les programmes (CSP)

This item will also be considered at the meeting of APPC on 7th November.

03.07 Other business

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.