

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee held on 23rd January 2003, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in Room 609, James (Administration) Building.

Present: I. Vinet (Chair), E. Cooper, M. Crago, G. Demopoulos, Ph. Depalle, J. Galbraith, M. Graham, W. Hendershot, A. Lau, H.G. Leighton, J. Zucchi, H.M.C. Richard (Secretary to the Committee)
Regrets: J. Bilec, C. Bushnell, F. Groen, H. Knox, P. Martineau, A.C. Masi, N. Peters, G. Philie, L. Proulx, F. Sagel
Guests: I. Butler (items 6, 7, 8), L. Reven (item 6), D. Lametti (item 7)

Documents circulated at the meeting:

09.01 Proposed agenda

The agenda was approved with a change in the order in which items were considered. Items 6, 7, and 8 were moved to the fore.

09.02 Minutes of meeting held on January 9, 2003

Adopted with addition of Professor John Zucchi to the list of members present.

09.03. Report on Senate meeting on January 15, 2003, re. 346th APPC Report to Senate

Senate approved the African Field Study Semester (for as long as it is administered by Langara College) and the creation of the Centre for Research on Pain.

09.04 Business arising

- a) from meetings on December 5, 2002 and January 9, 2003
re. Checklist for Field Study Semesters (referred to SCTP)

Following submission of further comments and suggestions, SCTP will be reviewing the proposed checklist for Field Study Semester proposals.

- b) from meeting on November 21, 2002
Graduate Admissions, Retention, and Funding Issues (02-APPC-11-20, updated 02-APPC-12-24 b)

This subject will be discussed at a meeting of Deans.

09.05 Broad questions

Comité de suivi des programmes

- CSP background information and calendar (02-APPC-12-25)
- CSP recommendations - Physics, Mathematics, Computer Science Programs (02-APPC-12-26)
- CSP recommendations - Literary Studies, Modern Languages and Literature, and Ancient Studies (02-APPC-01-34)

This item was not considered.

09.06 Proposed Centre for Self-Assembled Chemical Structures (02-APPC-01-36)

Associate Vice-Principal (Research) Ian Butler and Professor Linda Reven, Interim Director of the proposed Centre, joined the meeting and presented the proposal. It was noted that this proposal and that of the Centre for Intellectual Property Policy (item 7) were developed according to the proposed research centre guidelines (item 8). It was stated that the proposed Centre for Self-Assembled Chemical Structures was based neither on the materials studied nor on a common application goal, but instead on the method of forming new structures, and this is what makes it unusual. The membership list on page 2 reflects a history of collaboration with researchers from Université de Montréal, Université de Sherbrooke, and Université Laval. The Centre will provide a useful infrastructure for this interdisciplinary area of research involving people with different expertise. A seminar series is already in place and funding is being sought from Fonds de recherche de la Nature et des Technologies du Québec (NATEQ). A number of required

corrections in the proposal were noted. The second and third sentences in the first paragraph on the first page should be deleted. So should the last two sentences of the second-to-last paragraph on page 3. On page 5 (3rd line from the end of the first paragraph) and on page 10 (3rd line from the end of the text), the title of the Vice-Principal (Research) should be corrected.

Discussion ensued. Questions dealt with modes of collaboration, space requirements, efforts to bring researchers into geographic proximity, staff hiring, and relations with other centres, such as the McGill Institute for Advanced Materials (MIAM), and possible fusion and mergers of centres for funding reasons. There was also a question as to whether the Centre would be a McGill centre with members from other universities or an inter-university centre based at McGill and housed here. The reason given for the director to be from McGill, i.e. “because the secretarial/administrative back-up will be at McGill”, was thought to be a loose one. Were Université de Montréal to provide administrative support, would the director come from that university? After the sentence was revised to read: “The secretarial/administrative back-up will be at McGill and the Director will be from McGill”, it was agreed that the sentence should be deleted altogether.

The point was made that it was advantageous to have the physical location for the Centre at McGill, although it may not be absolutely necessary that the director should be from McGill (the Centre de Recherches Mathématiques based at Université de Montréal has a McGill staff member as its director).

It was noted that the composition of the governing Board provides for “several full Members of the Centre” (who may be from McGill and from other universities) and only “one person outside of University who is not involved in the Centre”, but that person would be able to provide professional representation from the chemical industry or other stakeholders. An inconsistency regarding the term of office of the director (three years on page 4 and two years on page 10) should be corrected. It was also noted that the McGill name should not appear in the names of research centres according to the new guidelines.

With the necessary minor revisions, the proposal was approved for submission to Senate.

09.07 **Proposed McGill Centre for Intellectual Property Policy (02-APPC-01-35)**

Professor David Lametti joined the meeting and presented the proposal. He stated that it was hard to understate the importance of the proposed Centre for Intellectual Property Policy (CIPP). Its originality lies in the viewing of technology through the lens of intellectual property policy and the theoretical filter. It builds on McGill strengths, creates a niche and will help develop the necessary critical mass to attract good colleagues and graduate students. It also builds on a good network of connections. Those connections to McGill faculties may be understated in the proposal; the scholars involved in the Centre will be prepared to work with all faculties. The CIPP will be McGill’s contribution to the proposed multi-university consortium, *Regroupement universitaire de la propriété intellectuelle*, which will involve UQAM, Université de Montréal and McGill. Funding is being sought and initial contacts indicate a positive response from industry and lawyers. The first director will be Richard Gold, holder of the Bell Chair in e-Governance and leading expert in Canada on biotechnology intellectual property.

In the discussion it was stated that certain Faculty of Law colleagues who have expressed interest in participating in the CIPP and in taking part in various projects were already known to be heavily solicited. It was suggested and agreed that **there should be a list of Centre Members per se and another list of Associate Members**. Centre membership should be vetted from the onset and, as proposed in the research centre checklist, different classes of membership should be included. Although the checklist specifies that “there will normally be at least twelve Full Members” a smaller number of fully engaged members may be preferable to having a larger number of less involved ones. Although scholars at Université de Montréal and UQAM were approached, no one as yet has offered to join. Université de Montréal with its Centre for Public Law has taken the technology route which complements McGill’s proposal. It was suggested that Board membership (item 5 of the proposed Bylaws) should include more than “one person from outside the University” community representative. The use of the term “McGill Fellows of the Centre” (item 7 on page 8 for example) was thought to be confusing: “full members of the Centre” should be used. “Postdoctoral fellows” should be changed throughout the document to “postdoctoral scholars”. The statement that “Postdoctoral Fellows of the Centre shall hold academic appointments in the University” should be amended to read: “It is expected that most McGill members shall hold academic appointments in the University and that Postdoctoral Scholars shall be registered at McGill.” The sentence at the top of page 2 should read: “The CIPP will also complement the acknowledged leadership of McGill in related areas ~~outside the law~~ such as genomics, biotechnology, information technology, and communications.”

With respect to the bylaws, it was noted that the proposed research centre checklist (02-APPC-01-37) specifies that the annual report should be submitted to the Vice-Principal (Research), whereas the CIPP bylaws state only that the Centre's Annual Report will be submitted to the Research Development Committee, for the purposes of requesting renewal of University funding. It seemed essential that the annual report should be submitted to central administration so as to help ensure the necessary interaction. The proposed bylaws should be revised accordingly.

Some of the activities listed under the heading 5. Research Activity on page 4 were questioned. It was suggested that the third and fourth points regarding the creation of networks and the provision of continuing education should fall under a new section 6 titled "Outreach Activities". The nature of the Centre's research activities and the nature of the collaboration between members required clarification as it was felt that the cohesiveness of the Centre, as opposed to a juxtaposition of scholars, failed to come through in the proposal. It was felt that the document should be somewhat sharpened in that respect. In response to that comment the expanding and exploding nature of intellectual property and the involvement of Faculty members in the area were explained. Substantive implications and proposals are continually hitting Faculty staff; as an example, the Faculty of Law was recently approached regarding a project to help Ukraine put in place intellectual property structures and regulations, for which CIDA has been approached for funding. Projects such as this one will bring colleagues together; the Centre will provide a framework for fostering collaboration on what are urgent and relevant issues. It was further stated that the Centre hopes to take part in policy development in a formal way by bringing in colleagues working on life forms. Given the current revolution in intellectual property and the social and legal issues being raised, with all kinds of implications, there would be no shortage of subject matter for research and outreach activity. It was suggested that **the new section on Outreach Activity should include two additional items: "acting in an advisory capacity to organizations and governments which are developing policies" and, as a last point on the list, interacting with McGill's Office of Technology Transfer.**

The importance of touching other disciplines and of establishing a beacon for McGill were underlined. The Centre structure would develop as involvement grows. In the discussion it was argued that a partnership with someone working in genomics who was not doing research on intellectual property may not be considered to be a collaborative effort, and that Centre scholars might be developing policies but not contributing to scholarship in the disciplinary field. Professor Lametti disagreed, giving music as an example where legal standards are intertwined with the creation of music; the question is whether the process is creating property in the first place. The creative process cannot be disentangled from the legal process. Legal scholars are also collaborating in the development of a common language. Through another example the point was reinforced that it is important for McGill to develop not only expertise in the intellectual property field but collaboration with researchers in other disciplines. The CIPP would combine areas of strength and add another layer to them. The Centre should become more than a legal core and will have to involve other faculties with other interests. Greater attention should be given to its membership which should include associate members from other faculties.

The proposed Centre was acknowledged as an important initiative. Given sensitive developments in the field in Quebec, it was believed that McGill's CIPP would be in a good position for being granted provincial funding and its approval should not be delayed. Given current time pressures, it was the Committee's recommendation that work on the proposal should **focus for now on shortening the Centre membership, while the membership should be expanded in the future to include members in other disciplines. A point should be added to the section on Future Developments: "to attract members from across a variety of disciplines."**

There was a sense of confidence that the proposed Centre would make a significant contribution and soon acquire an international reputation. It was agreed that the following revisions should be done before the proposal could be submitted to Senate for approval:

- 1) editing (typos, replacing "McGill fellows" with "McGill staff members, and "postdoctorals" with "postdoctoral scholars" etc.);
- 2) adding a section on Outreach Activities and adding an item to the section on Future Developments, as indicated above;
- 3) adding one sentence stating that the Centre will optimize linkages to other disciplines and with relevant partners outside the University (Martha Crago wrote in a possible wording on a copy she gave Ian Butler);
- 4) defining full and associate members and then dividing the proposed membership list into those two categories.

The proposed Centre for Intellectual Property Policy was approved for submission to Senate on

condition that revisions should meet the Chair's expectations.

09.08 **Guidelines for Research Centre** (revised) (02-APPC-01-37)

Associate Vice-Principal Ian Butler presented the revisions that were made to the document since APPC considered it on October 10, 2002 and APPC discussed the revised document.

Regarding Board membership, it was suggested that the text under item 4 of the Minimal bylaws "Membership of Board" on page 4 should reflect the text on page 2, indicating that when several faculties are associated with the Centre, there should be a rotation of chairs among the deans. It was noted that the number of Board members may vary from one centre to another, depending on the needs of each one. A board should normally bring representation of all possible connections within the University, collaborating universities, and industrial, governmental or other entities. The Board should select its members in such a way as to optimize representation of all interested parties. The duties and responsibilities of the Board, such as approving the Centre's membership, reviewing the Centre's annual report etc. should be clearly spelled out in the proposed Minimal bylaws.

It was agreed that a statement motivating the guidelines should be included. Such a statement would explain the purpose and function of research centres, including the leveraging factor for applying for research funding. It was noted that the function of a centre may vary, depending on the disciplinary sector.

The number of Centre members, specified as being "at least twelve Full Members" under item 7 of the proposed Minimal Bylaws, was felt to be unduly restrictive if taken literally. It was stated that the word "normally" would take care of the proposed numbers, and that full members could be external to McGill and be counted. It was explained that a number of centres had become close to inactive as membership numbers had shrunk drastically, and it was useful for more stringent guidelines to be introduced. The requirements of provincial granting agencies also had to be taken into consideration; McGill had to step in line for taking greater advantage of funding opportunities by increasing its collective efforts.

It was stated that the rewriting of the research centre checklist might provide an opportunity and a stimulus for closing centres that do not conform. It was indeed agreed that the guidelines should apply not only to the creation of centres but to the management of all existing centres. They would constitute a major tool for moving University research forward.

In response to a question about the statement in the opening paragraph on the need for the goals of the research centre to "clearly relate to the McGill strategic plan", it was reported that Principal Munroe-Blum will be initiating a strategic plan document for September 2003. A research centre proposal would have to indicate that the proposal is in concordance with the University's basic planning principles. Strategic planning also refers to the development of priorities for the fundraising campaign in March/April, as well as the University's discussion paper entitled "Tradition and Innovation: An International University in a City of Knowledge" presented to the MEQ in September 1999; strategic thinking is being fostered. The University provides start-up funding for centers and although it now budgets for funds for centres it still does not provide the financial support that other competing universities provide. Centres tend to be dependent on external grants, which means that when funding decreases, centres tend to become idle.

It was agreed that **all new centre bylaws should be brought to APPC for formal approval (this would include the bylaws of centres already approved by Senate such as the Centre for Research on Pain and the Centre for Bioinformatics Research (and the Centre for Self-Assembled Chemical Structures approved earlier at the meeting).**

APPC's discussion concluded on an agreement that **the document should be further revised as agreed to in the discussion. The revised document should be e-mailed to APPC members along with the necessary preface and should also be brought to a forthcoming meeting of the Provosts' own Academic Planning Group.**

It was also suggested and agreed that **a checklist should accompany all new centre proposals submitted by the Research Policy Committee; they should indicate whether or not letters from relevant deans and curricula vitae have been provided and the dates at which the proposal was reviewed by the various committees involved in the approval process. This should be a sign-off form similar to that used for programs.**

09.09 **Principal's Prize for Excellence in Teaching**
Proposed amendments to the guidelines (02-APPC-01-38)

This item will be considered at the next meeting.

09.10 **Other business**

None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.