

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on Wednesday, February 14, 2007, at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232), Leacock Building.

PRESENT:

Algieri, Stefano	Hobbins, John	Quaroni, Enrica
Angus, Adrian	Itzkowicz, Jake	Rhéaume, Alexandra
Barralet, Jake	Jacobs-Starkey, Linda	Richard, Marc
Bartlett, Kim	Jonsson, Wilbur	Robaire, Bernard
Bennett, Hamilton	Kasirer, Nicholas	Roulet, Nigel
Bhatt, Vikram	Kirk, Andrew	Saroyan, Alenoush
Bouchard, Carl-Eric	Levin, Richard I.	Schmidt, Janine
Bouchentouf, Myriam	Lewis, Brian	Sedgwick, Donald
Bracewell, Robert	Lund, James	Serero, Didier
Burns, David	Maric, Milan	Shaughnessy, Honora
Chiang, Albert	Masi, Anthony	Skaf, Dora Maria
Cox, Amy	McDougall, Sally	Steinhauer, Karsten
Donny-Clark, Aaron	McGruthers, Lauren	Stroud, Sarah
Dowsley, Martha	McLean, Donald	Tallant, Beverlea
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Frances	McSweeney, Kerry	Thérien, Denis
Fujinaga, Ichiro	Mendelson, Morton	Todd, Peter
Glaser, Alison	Moore, Timothy	Upham, Finn
Glenn, Jane	Munroe-Blum, Heather (<i>Chair</i>)	Wade, Kevin
Goldbloom, Michael	Nemes, James	Waugh, Sean
Grant, Martin	Newlove, Chris	Whitesides, Sue
Harris, Ralph	Paré, Anthony	Zannis-Hadjopoulos, Maria
Henderson, Ian	Peterson, Kathryn	Pelletier, Johanne (<i>Secretary</i>)
Henderson, Jim	Pierre, Christophe	

REGRETS: Antonia Arnaert, Glenn Cartwright, Roshi Chadha, Annick Chapedelaine, Ronald Chase, Judy Dear, Kohur GowriSankaran, Michael Hoechsmann, Frederick Kingdom, Barry Levy, Chandra Madramootoo, Christopher Manfredi, Richard Pound, Robert Rabinovitch, Manon Vennat, Christina Wolfson.

The Principal thanked Professor James Nemes for his dedicated service as interim Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and welcomed the new Dean Martin Kreiswirth.

1. REPORT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

The report of the Steering Committee (06-07:06) was received.

Item 1, Chair of Senate, on motion by Professor Kasirer, seconded by Mr. Hobbins, Senate agreed that Dean McLean would chair Senate, allowing the Principal to respond to the question concerning the full-provostial model.

Senate Steering further recommends at their meeting preceeding this Senate meeting, that Professor Don McLean act as Chair in the Principal's absence after 4:30 pm should the meeting continue beyond this time.

Item 2, Approval of Minutes of Senate, on motion by Ms. Dowsley, seconded by Professor Harris, the minutes of the meeting of January 17, 2007, were approved.

In reply to a question from Mr. Hobbins regarding a specified time for bringing back to Senate the motion referred to on page 3 of the minutes, the Secretary-General explained that Associate Vice-Principal Nicell and Professor Mucci (Chair of the Committee on Ancillary Services) agreed to meet and report to Senate Nominating Committee at their earliest convenience.

Item 3, Senate Meeting Dates 2007-2008, on motion by Professor Whitesides, seconded by Professor Harris, the meeting dates were approved.

Item 4. Speaking Rights, on motion by Ms. Dowsley, seconded by Professor Quaroni, Professor Wendy Thomson (Director, School of Social Work) was granted speaking rights to reply to questions regarding major revisions to the Bachelor's program in Social Work.

Item 5. Senate Rules of Order, was noted.

2. AGENDA

On motion by Professor Zannis-Hadjopoulos, seconded by Mr. Sedgwick, the Agenda was approved.

3. CHAIR'S REMARKS

The Principal extended her condolences on the passing away of the former director of the Economic Council of Canada, Irving Brecher, who taught over 28 years at McGill. Mr. Brecker was one of the founding directors of the International Centre for Rights and Democracy, today known as Rights and Democracy.

Updating Senate on a range of issues arising, the Principal informed Senate of her participation in an ad hoc group on University governance chaired by Jean-Marie Toulouse, former Director of HEC. She noted that McGill is hosting the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada conference (February 14 to 16) marking the 25th anniversary of the Charter of Rights and Freedom.

She informed Senate of various meetings with government officials at the federal level. She noted an upcoming meeting with the Minister of Finance to encourage attention to funding research granting councils, Canada Research Chairs and others programs that support research and graduate studies at competitive levels.

The Principal reported on having hosted the February 7 press conference in which she and her counterparts at Laval, Montréal and Sherbrooke universities called on the provincial government to address chronic university underfunding and proposed a reinvestment plan. On the municipal front, the Principal reported that she and Vice-Principal Michael Goldbloom had met with Mayor Tremblay to discuss the University's relationship with the city of Montreal, including the advancement of our facilities development.

Finally she congratulated members of the community on their achievements, including Professor Emeritus Charles Taylor, named co-chair of a commission with Gérard Bouchard to consult on practices of accommodation related to cultural differences; Professor Emeritus John Jonas, named one of the three finalists for the NSERC Gerhard Herzberg Canada Gold Medal; Professor Matt Haimovitz, who earned rave reviews for his participation in a concert at Merkin Concert Hall, with Professors Douglas McNabney and Jonathan Crow.

In research news, Drs. Constantine Polychronakos and Rob Sladek, with scientists from Imperial College, London and other international institutions, have identified the genes associated with a risk of developing type-2 diabetes. A team led by Dr. Michel Tremblay has discovered that suppressing the activities of the PTB1B gene in mice predisposed to developing breast cancer helped slow the growth of certain types of

tumours. Finally, *Science* magazine had a focus piece on the International Laboratory for Brain, Music and sound research (BRAMS), a joint project of McGill University and Université de Montréal co-directed by McGill's Dr. Robert Zatorre and the Université de Montréal's Dr. Isabelle Peretz.

4. QUESTION RE FULL-PROVOSTIAL MODEL

Professor Harris asked the following question:

I am aware that the Office of the Provost has made presentations around campus on this matter. In fact, a first rate, highly informative and very well received presentation was made at MAUT Council yesterday by Dr. Winer. The reason I pose this question to the administration is that in response to discussion with a significant number of Senators who are not members of MAUT Council, it is my feeling that all Senators would benefit from learning some of the details as presented by Dr. Winer yesterday.

Whereas Senate has been informed of the recent completion of the transfer of McGill to a Full-Provostial Model for Administration and Governance;

Whereas research has found that there is no single definition of the roles of a Provost at a University and indeed the responsibility of University Provosts can be highly diverse and unaligned one to another;

Whereas research has turned up nothing on a definition of the term "full-provostial model";

Would the Administration provide a detailed description of McGill's full-provostial model?

The Principal provided the following answer:

Thank you, Senator Harris for your question, and for this opportunity to provide Senate with some detail regarding the provostial model we have adopted at McGill.

I will begin by saying that we have adopted a provostial model at McGill with a view to ensuring that different administrative processes within the University, particularly academic planning, budget planning and approval, infrastructure renewal, and campaign planning, are integrated and working in support of each other in the achievement of our academic mission.

OUR PEERS

I will provide you with some details of our particular provostial model at McGill. First, in order to give you some context, I will mention that the model of combining the responsibility for the academic aspects of university operation with responsibility for the budgeting process is widespread among out Canadian and AAU peers:

- ◆ *8 of the G13 have adopted the model, including Toronto, Alberta and UBC as well as McGill.*
- ◆ *30 of the 35 public members of the AAU (including McGill and Toronto) have adopted a model combining responsibility for academics and the budgeting process, though in a few cases it is called by another name.*
- ◆ *16 of the 26 private members of the AAU have also adopted the model.*

Finally, a caveat on nomenclature: many university offices have evolved over the years and in a particular context and set of traditions. One should expect, then, that the detail of particular provostial functions will vary somewhat from institution to institution. The essential point is the alignment of decision-making processes, particularly the budget processes, in support of academic priorities.

THE PROVOSTIAL MODEL AT MCGILL

In this model, the Principal and Vice-Chancellor holds the position of academic head of McGill, and Chief Executive Officer of the University, and all Vice-Principals act on behalf of the Principal.

The Provost is the second-in-command: when the Principal is away from the University, and the Provost present, he is acting Principal.

The Provost reports to the Principal, taking on the functions of Chief Academic Officer, the responsibility for the multi-year budget process, and, in collaboration with the Vice-Principal (Administration & Finance), responsibility for aligning administrative support with priorities established in planning documents such as the White Paper, or Academic Plan, the report of the Principal's Task Force and the Campuses Master Plan. And all of this, in support of the academic mission.

The primary responsibilities of the Provost's Office:

- ❖ *Advancing the academic goals of the University:*
 - ◆ *In collaboration with the Deputy Provost (Student life and Learning), the Provost assumes responsibility for academic programmes and services at the graduate, undergraduate and professional levels, enhancing McGill's performance as a student-centred, research-intensive University.*
 - ◆ *The Provost provides the academic leadership to renew and increase the strength of the professoriate, the faculties and departments; to promote existing, and encourage new, inter-faculty and interdisciplinary teaching programmes while reinforcing core areas of excellence.*
 - ◆ *With the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) in the lead and reporting to the Principal, the Provost collaborates in supporting interdisciplinary research programmes, centres and institutes, through the academic renewal and budgeting processes.*
 - ◆ *In collaboration with the Principal and Vice-Principals, particularly the Vice-Principal (Development and Alumni Relations), the Provost takes a leadership role in the white paper which forms the basis for choosing the campaign priorities. These priorities form a subset of McGill's academic priorities.*
 - ◆ *In collaboration with the Vice-Principal (Inter-Institutional Relations), the Provost supports the Principal in advocacy with the governments of Canada and Québec, and with the City of Montreal, in advancing McGill's public policy and funding priorities.*
- ❖ *Responsibility for the budget process:*
 - ◆ *The Provost is responsible, in collaboration with the Principal and the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance) for the development of the University budget, for reporting on budget considerations to Senate and the Board of Governors, and for submitting the annual budget to Board for approval.*
 - ◆ *The Deans of McGill's faculties, the Director of Continuing Education, and the Trenholme Director of Libraries report to the Provost. The Vice-Principal (Health Affairs), who is also the Dean of Medicine, reports to the Principal on hospital matters.*
 - ◆ *The Deans and the Directors of Continuing Education and of Libraries engage in a compact process with the Provost through which budget allocations are made to academic units.*
- ❖ *Alignment of institutional decision-making processes*
 - ◆ *In collaboration with the Principal and Vice-Principals, the Provost takes a leadership role in ensuring that institutional decision-making processes are integrated and aligned in support of the academic mission and of McGill's academic priorities, and that measures to ensure accountability are developed and implemented.*

- ♦ *The Provost collaborates with the Vice-Principal (Administration & Finance), and the Associate Vice-Principal (University Services) in ensuring that decisions on construction, renewal and upgrading of the 'parc immobilier' and other facilities are consistent with academic priorities and our commitment to greener campuses that are well integrated with the surrounding community.*
- ♦ *The Chief Information Officer reports to the Provost, and the Office of Planning and Institutional Analysis is within the provostial portfolio, thus contributing to the alignment of decision-making processes.*

As a supplemental question, Professor Harris asked whether an organizational chart is available reflecting this model.

The Principal replied that an organizational chart is available on the Provost's website showing areas related to the Office of the Provost. An organizational chart of the administration and governance of the University is being prepared by the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General added that the chart would be web-available soon, likely on a site entitled "About McGill".

Professor Glenn requested that the chart be attached to the minutes. The Secretary-General explained that the web chart will be multi-layered but agreed to attach to the minutes a version that captures the top layer.

Mr. Donny-Clark, noting that the Provostial model appears to have the Provost involved in every aspect of the University, asked the Principal to clarify where the Provost is not involved.

The Principal clarified that the executive team work very closely together rather than in a hierarchical model. The executive team meets on a regular basis to exchange and share information. While there are domains where the Provost's office plays a supportive role rather than a leading role, he must be sufficiently involved to comment on major undertakings that may affect the academic mission of the University.

Professor Moore asked whether there was a plan to evaluate the performance and effectiveness of this provostial model.

The Principal explained that this model has been well tested at other Universities, and invited Professor Moore to communicate any suggestions to Professor Henry Mintzberg who has carried out a comprehensive review of the performance of McGill's administrative operations. She further explained that each member of the executive team sets goals and priorities for the year ahead and reports on achievements in the previous year. These reports are presented to Senate and Board of Governors in a condensed format in the fall of each academic year. This process, which is carried out on a yearly basis, gives the administration the opportunity to review and refine its performance.

In reply to a question from Ms. Bouchentoff regarding structural reform to meet the new goals under the provostial model, the Principal stated that this is an administrative matter. She further added that each Vice-Principal has autonomy to structure their portfolios to meet her/his goals.

5. QUESTION RE UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH

Mr. Bouchard asked the following question:

On May 24th 2006 the Vice-Principal and Provost agreed to return to Senate with more information regarding statistics on percentage of students taking part in research and the percent of grant money that they are receiving.

On October 16 2002 Vice-Principal Vinet, in a question regarding undergraduate research, stated that one of the advantages of an undergraduate student attending a research intensive university should be the opportunity to be involved in research.

Recently there has been much discussion around the goals and priorities in a student centered research intensive university. A good case could be made that central to this type of institution is the idea that research opportunities for undergraduate students should be actively encouraged not only by the departments and faculties but also by the central administration. Furthermore, academic undergraduate experiences are instrumental in providing students with a direction that they wish their research careers to go and as such should be one of the highest priorities in a student centered research intensive university.

At McGill we are in the privileged position of providing our students with exposure to some of the best and most cutting edge research in the country, something that we should be capitalizing on.

Considering this my questions are the following:

Will the Vice-Principal and Provost provide statistics regarding undergraduate student involvement in research at the university (for example, the percent of students taking part and percent of grant money received)?

What steps, financial and other, is the university presently taking and is planning to take to encourage, support and recognize undergraduate research in the university?

What is the priority of undergraduate research at McGill?

Professor Mendelson thanked Mr. Bouchard for raising this question about a very important topic and provided the following reply:

Senators who were present at Senate on September 20, 2006, will recall that I responded at length to virtually the same question, so today I will only touch upon the essentials.

To answer the last question first, undergraduate participation in research and the nexus between teaching and research are indeed priorities at McGill, as stated in the White Paper, as expressed in the definition of a student-centered university proposed by the Principal's Task Force on Student Life and Learning, and as expressed in the guidelines for the Academic Program Review, which is currently underway.

Statistics are available regarding enrolment in various courses that presumably have a research / scholarship component – viz., project courses, reading courses, research courses, and undergraduate thesis courses. For the last four complete academic years, the undergraduate enrolment for fall-winter-summer terms in these courses has been 7,207 (02-03), 7,691 (03-04), 7,515 (04-05), and 7,309 (05-06). Data such as these will be used to track undergraduate participation in research. Student participation in non-credited research activities and money spent on undergraduate research participation are harder to track and would likely require direct surveys of faculty and/or students.

The most progress in this important area will certainly involve initiatives by departments, schools, or faculties. The Faculty of Science appears to be leading the way at McGill in this regard, and other faculties might follow its example – e.g., by setting up an Undergraduate Research Office and establishing an Undergraduate Research Conference. However, research and scholarship differ across disciplines, so local variations on the general themes are needed.

At the University level, the APPC Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning has undertaken an examination of the nexus between teaching and research. We have established a subcommittee that is

drawing on the expertise of professional associates in Teaching and Learning Services to accomplish the following goals:

- *Examine current practices and programs within McGill and at comparable institutions across North America to identify how best to promote enriched linkages between research and undergraduate teaching*
- *Make recommendations about how to increase awareness of, and ongoing support for, undergraduate research in disciplines across campus.*

In reply to a question from Ms. Upham, Professor Mendelson explained that when SCTL addressed the issue of the nexus between research and teaching, it led to the discussion of undergraduate attributes. It was agreed that the two perspectives should be dealt with simultaneously in order to speed up the process.

Ms. Rhéaume asked whether there were avenues available for undergraduate students to lobby and advance the role of undergraduates in research.

Professor Mendelson noted that the Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning includes graduate and undergraduate students in its membership. However, he emphasized that the issue should be addressed at the Department or Faculty level and called on those units to engage undergraduate students in research.

Professor Robaire noted that the cost of engaging students in laboratory research is high. He asked whether there would be any proposal for funding to encourage professors to engage undergraduate students in their laboratories and give them direct exposure to research.

Professor Mendelson indicated that the funding of Faculties is organized through the compacts developed between the Provost and the Deans. There is no central fund available independent of this process.

Mr. Itzkowitz and Mr. Bouchard asked whether tuition fees from undergraduate research courses could be a possible source for funding undergraduate research.

The Provost explained that in the budget process, enrolment driven funding has been purposely detached from the way that priorities are negotiated with Deans. Under the old model, which was driven by enrolment, more tuition was generated from higher enrolments. This led to an imbalanced student/staff ratio, which did not support high quality educational experience. The Provost said he does not feel that that Senate is the place to discuss a budget plan to support undergraduate research. However, he noted that direct involvement in research is not the only way undergraduates obtain research exposure. He stressed that undergraduate students benefitting greatly from the research conducted by professors both through written materials and through interaction with those researchers.

6. 387TH REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Professor Mendelson presented the 387th Report of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (D06-36).

Regarding Item 1.A.1. New Teaching Programs, Faculty of Arts, the Bachelor's program in Social Work was approved.

Item 1.A.2. Faculty of Education, The B.Ed. in Kindergarten and Elementary; First Nations and Inuit Studies was approved.

Item I.A. 3. Faculty of Science, Senate approved the B.Sc.; Major in Atmospheric Science; Atmospheric Chemistry, the B.Sc.; Honours in Atmospheric Science; Atmospheric Chemistry and the B.Sc. Liberal Degree Program and more particularly each of the following proposed programs:

- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Anatomy and Cell Biology;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Biochemistry;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Biology;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Chemistry; Biological;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Chemistry; Physical;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Chemistry; General;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Computer Science;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Earth and Planetary Sciences;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Geography;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Mathematics;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Statistics;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Microbiology and Immunology;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Physics;*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Physiology; and*
- *B.Sc.; Core Science Component in Psychology.*

Item I.B. Change in Department Name and Mergers, Senate approved and agreed to recommend to the Board of Governors the proposed name change for the Department of Theory in the Schulich School of Music to Department of Music Research.

Professor Mendelson then referred to page 20 of the report and informed Senate that 226 courses were retired. He then noted that the Graduate Thesis Student Questionnaire Final Report is attached to the Report and invited Interim Dean Nemes to comment on this item.

Interim Dean Nemes explained that the purpose of the Graduate Thesis Student Questionnaire was to survey graduate students with a view to improve graduate education and research supervision at McGill. He noted that a full version of the report would be available that will include additional results and breakdown of results by Faculty. He stated that the report is being referred to a working group on supervisory issues of the Council of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to discuss whether the questionnaire should be continued and, if so, in what format.

Professor Harris asked if it would be possible to provide information on neutral responses. Interim Dean Nemes said the final report would include mean results, which would give an indication of neutral responses.

Professor Paré asked if the final report would show a breakdown between the “agree” and “strongly agree” results. Professor Nemes replied that while the “agree” and “strongly agree” results had been combined as one value, a breakdown could be provided.

Professor Robaire asked if any specific policies would be developed as a result of the survey.

Professor Nemes replied that the work group on supervisory issues developed a policy for graduate student supervision which has been approved by the Council of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and will come to Senate for discussion. The policy is the result of some of the finding in this report.

Professor Saroyan noted that the lowest satisfaction ratings were related to funding issues. She asked if there are any recommendations to address this problem. Professor Nemes replied that increased graduate student funding is clearly stated as one of the goals in the White Paper and is one of the recommendations of the Task Force on Student Life and Learning.

7. AMENDMENTS TO THE POLICY FOR THE ACCOMMODATION OF RELIGIOUS HOLY DAYS

Deputy Provost Mendelson presented the amendments to the Policy for the Accommodation of Religious Holy Days (D06-37), explaining the legal reasons for retaining the phrase “without undue hardship” as recommended by the Executive of the Board of Governors in returning the policy to Senate. On motion by Professor Mendelson, seconded by Ms. Cox, Senate approved and recommended to the Board of Governors approval of the following resolution :

Be it resolved that Section 2 under Procedures of the Policy for the Accommodation of Religious Holy Days be amended to read:

“c) shifting the weight normally assigned to the evaluation to the weight assigned to ~~the remaining~~ other components of the evaluation.

When the instructor and student are unable to agree on suitable accommodation, the matter will be referred to the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean who may request official documentation confirming the requirements of the student's religious affiliation observance. The Associate Dean will decide whether reasonable accommodation without undue hardship is possible, and what accommodation is to be made in this instance, and will convey the decision to the instructor and student.”

8. NOTICE OF A MOTION TO AMEND THE STATUTES

The Notice of motion to amend the *Statutes* (D06-38) is presented for information. This item will be discussed and voted upon at the next Senate meeting on March 7, 2007.

9. NOTICE FOR INFORMATION – SAFE DISCLOSURE POLICY

Senate received the *Safe Disclosure Policy* (D06-39) for its information. This item will be presented at the March 28 Senate meeting for discussion and approval.

10. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Senate received the report of the Board of Governors (D06-40).

Ms. Upham was happy to see the detailed list of representatives that represent the University elsewhere. She asked if there would be comprehensive list of members to better understand the breadth of the University's representation in the community. The Secretary-General agreed to provide such a list.

Mr. Hobbins noted that administrators, in general, are appointed for a five-year renewable term whereas the Vice-Principal (Inter-Institutional Relations) has been appointed for an undetermined term. He asked if there would be a review at some point.

The Principal replied in the affirmative, indicating that there would be reviews on an annual basis. She explained that, in general, individuals appointed from within the tenure stream have a term limit. However, this differs from appointment to appointment in the non-tenure streamed administrative appointment areas.

Mr. Itzkowitz noted that it was his understanding that the administrative response to the Report of the Task Force on Student Life and Learning was to be presented to Senate at the February meeting. He asked whether this matter has been postponed to a later date.

Deputy Provost Mendelson replied that the preliminary administrative response to the Task Force was to be prepared by February, and he expects it will be brought to Senate in March. The Principal added that the final administrative response to the Task Force would be presented to Senate in the fall.

The meeting ended at 4:30 pm.