

---

Minutes of the meeting of the **Academic Policy and Planning Committee** held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2004 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in Room 310, James Building

Present: L. Vinet (Chair), B. Arciero, J. Beheshti, A. Bryan, W. Caplin, R.F. Clarke, M. Dowsley, V. Errunza, J. Galbraith, W. Hendershot, P. Holland, J.C. Hurtubise, A. Husain, S. McDougall, M. Mendelson, M. Nahon, J. Zucchi, H.M.C. Richard (Secretary to the Committee)

Regrets: L. Butler-Kisber, M. Crago, J. Feine, A. Kenjeev, A.C. Masi

---

**Document circulated at the meeting:**

- Ph.D. in Education program proposal – letter from Dean Slee (04-APPC-11-18)

**03.01 Proposed agenda**

Approved.

**03.02 Minutes of meeting held on 30th September 2004**

The minutes were approved with one correction: on page 3, item 02.08, end of sixth line, “SCTL” should read “SCCE”.

**03.03 Business arising**

**a) APPC terms of reference (04-APPC-11-14)**

Senate approved the revisions to the APPC terms of reference on October 6, 2004. The new text was circulated to APPC for information.

**b) Report on Senate meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2004**

Academic Program Reviews (PVP, Sept 23; Senate Oct 6, 2004)

- McGill University Academic Program Review Process, as per Senate approval, October 6, 2004 (04 APPC-11-12 a)

- McGill Academic Program Review – detailed procedural guidelines, Oct. 19, 2004 (04-APPC-11-12 b)

On October 6, 2004, Senate approved the proposed Academic Program Review Process and received the detailed Procedural Guidelines, with a number of amendments. These are reflected and highlighted in the revised documents circulated to APPC (04-APPC-11-12 a & b). Senate amended the first paragraph of the Academic Program Review Process to reflect that the 1999 Cyclical Review Guidelines were not being entirely replaced by the Academic Program Review Process, but only the portion of them that deals with academic programs and teaching. Senate also wished to include the requirement of a review of the academic program review process to take place within two years after the completion of this round of the academic program review process (item 3.6 added to Stage 3). Furthermore in response to Senate’s wish to add the phrase “After receiving comments from and consultation with the units...” to item 12 of the Detailed Procedural Guidelines, the paragraph was expanded to read:

“After addressing the university and cross-university data and receiving input from those units or groups involved in the program, the Program Study Group will prepare the Program Review Document. This document is intended to explain the objectives and trends for the program and present clear and relevant descriptive information on the structure, operation, distinctive impact and scope of the program. See Appendix I for guidelines on preparing the Program Review Document. In the case of programs offered with the collaboration of other universities, see Appendix VII: “Partnerships”.

A new item 13 was inserted: “The Program Review Document will be forwarded by the PSG to the FRG.” Senate also asked for the addition of one item, now item 18, which reads:

“Finally, the PSG will be given an opportunity to respond to all comments and revise the document, if necessary. The Comment Sheet and all responses will be returned to the FRG.”

**c) Report on Senate meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2004**

- Ph.D. in Education program proposal – letter from Dean Slee (04-APPC-11-18)

Senate approved the proposed Ph.D. in Education on 17<sup>th</sup> October. The letter from Dean Slee in support of the program, requested by APPC, was circulated at the meeting.

**d) APPC statement of plans and priorities, for submission to Senate, September 24, 2004** (*Revised 04-APPC-09-09*)

APPC's Statement of plans and priorities, was submitted to the Secretary of Senate, as revised by APPC. Additional items of business were mentioned:

1) the **internationalization of McGill's teaching programs**, which the Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning may be asked to reflect on (minutes 02.08 of Sept 30 meeting); it was suggested that **this item should also be part of academic program reviews**;

2) the **A+ grade issue**. According to the minutes of the APPC meeting held on September 18, 2003, APPC was "not willing to reopen the debate on the A+ grading scheme in this academic year. It would be willing to reopen it next year (September 2004) if it could be shown that McGill were out of step with the AAU and G10 university institutions." On October 16, 2003 APPC considered information submitted by the Faculty of Science; minutes state that: "In the discussion the information submitted by Associate Dean Mendelson was found to be interesting but not convincing enough to reopen the debate at this time... APPC did not wish to hear about the issue before a whole year has gone by, when the Faculty of Science, if it so wishes, may make the case by gathering detailed information covering all 62 institutions of the AAU and specifying whether A+ is equivalent to 4.0 or 4.3." APPC had at that time declined to consider the A+ issue anew.

**03.04 Council of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

Terms of reference, membership, work plan for 2004-2005 (*04-APPC-11-11*)

In the absence of Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Martha Crago, Professor Meyer Nahon, who is a member of the CGPS, presented the report on the Council's terms of reference and work plan for 2004-2005. The CGPS was formed in fall 2001 when the administration of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies at McGill was restructured and began meeting in fall 2002. The CGPS approved the proposed work plan with the proviso that there would be additional new issues coming to the Council. In the discussion, time-to-completion was felt to be a critical issue. The DHL policy and impact on its value, given that up to 50% of students are granted this award in certain departments, is being reviewed by a CGPS working group. Another is looking into the mode of allocation of MGSF funding, which varies across disciplines. APPC members made a number of suggestions which Professor Nahon will take to CGPS.

**03.05 APPC Subcommittee on Courses and Teaching Programs (SCTP)**

- Report on meeting held on September 9, 2004 (*04-APPC-11-10*)

Regarding the retirement of the "M.A. in Linguistics", ie. the thesis program, it was noted that the University community was receiving mixed messages about master's thesis and non-thesis programs and departments have sometimes been advised to move more of their master's students into thesis programs in order to secure more research funding. It was argued that these questions were generally dealt with within departments. While support for students in non-thesis programs may be an issue in some departments, it does not seem to be so in other disciplines in which there may be few chances of getting funding. It was suggested and agreed that **the issue of thesis and non-thesis master's and whether one or the other should be encouraged, should be referred to the CGPS**. Professor Meyer Nahon will bring the issue to CGPS, although it may be thought to be a local issue for individual departments to consider.

**03.06 Research Policy Committee**

**a) Approval of new "Guidelines for Creating, Recognizing, and Maintaining Research Centre Status" and "Minimal By-laws for the Operation of a Research Centre"** (*04-APPC-11-16*)

Interim Vice-Principal (Research) Jacques Hurtubise presented the proposed new Research Centre Guidelines which are intended to supersede the Guidelines approved by Senate in May 1995. In January 2003, APPC considered an earlier version of the document. The revised text has gone through a series of consultations which included the Principal and Vice-Principals (PVP), the Provost's Associate Provosts Group (APG), the Deans, and MAUT, as outlined in Section B. The proposed Guidelines have been modified in three directions: 1) new research centres now have to be tied to Faculty priorities and Deans are more directly involved with the approval and oversight of centres; 2) the Guidelines specify size and clarify centre governance; 3) they stipulate that there should be automatic review as for academic programs.

In the discussion, it was stated that MAUT had expressed general satisfaction with the proposed guidelines but objected to there being a constraint on size; that constraint has been removed. It was also mentioned that the previous document did not make clear what counts and does not count as a McGill research centre (“off-shore” centres). If location of physical resources is a determining factor, it may be difficult to decide where centres that require no physical location reside. The Guidelines attempt to cover and legislate for all McGill research centres and provide safeguards for centres for which funding is provided. It was stated that the spirit of the McGill Guidelines should be reflected in multilateral agreements for inter-institutional centres involving McGill.

APPC agreed to a number of revisions to the “Guidelines for Creating, Recognizing, and Maintaining Research Centre Status” and to the “Minimal By-laws for the Operation of a Research Centre”:

- “The Governing Board” was replaced by “the Board” throughout the two documents.
- The last line of item 4 of the Guidelines and the 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> lines of item 3 of the By-laws were revised to read “... and at least one person from outside the Research Centre”, instead of “... from outside the University” and “... from outside the University, not directly involved in the Research Centre”.
- Item 9 of the Guidelines was rewritten to read: “A Research Centre that seeks formal recognition by McGill must first obtain approval from the faculties most concerned, and then from the Research Policy Committee, the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and, finally, Senate.”
- Item 11 (Dissolution of Research Centre) of the By-laws was moved to the end of item 10 of the Guidelines: “... before a designated period of approval has elapsed; if the Research Centre no longer satisfies the basic requirements laid down by the University, the Vice-Principal (Research) can recommend to the Provost that the Research Centre be closed. The Research Centre will normally be given up to one year from its dissolution to wind up its affairs.”
- Item 5 (Annual Report) of the Minimal By-laws should read: “The Director of the Research Centre will be responsible....”
- Item 6 (Membership) of the Minimal By-laws was revised to read:
  - (i) *Full Member*: A senior researcher whose principal research affiliation is with the Centre; in consequence, he cannot be a Full Member of more than one McGill Research Centre.
  - (ii) *Associate Member*: A senior researcher with significant research affiliation with the Centre; a researcher can be an Associate Member of more than one McGill Research Centre.
- The following was added to item 7 of the Minimal By-laws: “... and its decision will be final. The Research Centre’s budget is also prepared by the Director for approval by the Board.”

To a question regarding Deans’ responsibility for research centres, Professor Hurtubise responded that research centre boards are chaired by the Dean of the principal Faculty concerned, and include the Vice-Principal (Research) who is the University officer responsible for the funds but not for the management of the centres. All research centres now report to a Dean. It was also noted that item 10 of the Guidelines states APPC as a body for the review of the “renewal of the (research centre) designation and the time period of renewal”. Although the Research Policy Committee is not specifically mentioned, it is understood that the RPC will be part of the academic channels used.

APPC **approved** the proposed “Guidelines for Creating, Recognizing, and Maintaining Research Centre Status” and “Minimal By-laws for the Operation of a Research Centre” for submission to Senate, with the necessary **revisions**.

**b) Approval of the formation on a new Research Centre entitled “Centre for Biorecognition and Biosensors” (04-APPC-11-17)**

Interim Vice-Principal (Research) Jacques Hurtubise presented the revised version (October 2004) of the proposal for the creation of a Centre for Biorecognition and Biosensors, submitted by Professor Maryam Tabrizian and considered by APPC on May 13, 2004. The Centre received funding before it was officially created. It is a joint enterprise between Medicine and Dentistry and is supported by the Deans of the faculties of Medicine, Dentistry, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Engineering, and Science (their letters of support were appended to the May 2004 text). Space has now been secured for the Centre.

Revisions to the proposal and to the CBB By-laws were intended to make the two documents as compatible with the Research Centre Guidelines and to the Minimal By-laws as possible. Given the timeline, approval is urgently sought.

In the discussion, it was agreed that the very last paragraph on Teaching Release should be deleted. The proposal as revised was **approved for submission to Senate for approval (and recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors)**.

**03.07 Course evaluations – update, October 27, 2004 (04-APPC-11-15)**

This item will be considered at the next meeting.

**03.08 CREPUQ CUP/Comité du suivi sur les programmes (CSP) – Report # 13, “Architecture, Design, Development, Urban Planning and Urban Studies”, English translation (04-APPC-11-13)**

This item will be considered at the next meeting. It was agreed that **a member of the School of Architecture or of the School of Urban Planning should be invited to speak to the report.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.