

SENATE
McGILL UNIVERSITY

08-09:06

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on Wednesday February 11, 2009 at 2:30 p.m. in the Robert Vogel Council Room (Room 232), Leacock Building.

PRESENT:

Aitken, Ellen	Kreiswirth, Martin
Algieri, Stefano	Kurien, John
Allison, Paul	Ling, Andrew
Barralet, Jake	Low, Bronwen
Bishop, Alexandra	Lowther, David
Blachford, Gregg	Luther, Ryan
Blackett, Adelle	Madramootoo, Chandra
Boss, Valentin	Manfredi, Christopher
Boulet, Benoit	Masi, Anthony C.
Brackett, David	McIntosh, Matthew
Bray, Dorothy	McLean, Donald
Burgoyne, John Ashley	McSweeney, Kerry
Butler, Ian	Mendelson, Morton J.
Caplan, Eric	Moore, Timothy
Covo, David	Munroe Blum, Heather (<i>Chair</i>)
Dear, Judy	Neilson, Ivan
DeGuise, Alexander	Oxhorn, Philip
Dourley, Barbara	Pekoles, Gary
Dowie, Vaughan	Pelletier, Johanne (<i>Secretary</i>)
Driscoll, Brian	Peterson, Kathryn
Dyck, Alexander	Pierre, Christophe
Ericsson, Jan	Potter, Judith
Etemad, Hamid	Quaroni, Enrica
Everett, Jane	Richard, Marc
Ezzy-Jorgensen, Frances	Robaire, Bernard
Fox-Decent, Evan	Roy, François R.
Franklin, Keith	Schmidt, Janine
Gehr, Ronald	Smith, Michael
GowriSankaran, Kohur	Steinhauer, Karsten
Grant, Martin	Thérien, Denis
Grütter, Peter	Todd, Peter
Gulamhussein, Faizel	Turner, Kathleen
Harpp, David	Van Eyk, Helen
Hendren, Laurie	Vroom, Ann
Hobbins, John	Wade, Kevin
Johnston, Will	Weinstein, Marc
Jonsson, Wilbur	Wilkinson, Nadya
Jordan, Steve	Wolfson, Christina
Kasirer, Nicholas	Zannis-Hadjopoulos, Maria
Kirby, Torrance	Zorychta, Edith

REGRETS: Gillian Bartlett-Esquillant, Roshi Chada, Claudio Cuello, Johanne Hebert, Richard I. Levin, James G. Martin, Hélène Perrault, Richard Pound, Laurie Snider, Nandita Perumal, Robert Rabinovitch

The Principal welcomed all to Senate.

SECTION I

1. Resolution on the death of Professor Martin Weber

The following resolution on the death of Professor Martin Weber was read by Dean Christophe Pierre, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, and adopted unanimously by Senate.

Professor Marty Weber passed away on November 24, 2008. He joined the Department of Chemical Engineering at McGill as an Assistant Professor in 1965 after completing his B.S.E. at Princeton University in 1958 and his Sc.D. at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1964. He was promoted to Full Professor in 1976. He retired and became an Emeritus Professor in 2004. During his 38 years at McGill he excelled in teaching, research and service to the academic community.

Professor Weber was an innovative and dedicated teacher. He developed and taught the first engineering course in Canada which used the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI). In 1995, he received the Wighton Fellowship, for innovative and distinctive contributions to undergraduate laboratory instruction in recognition of his work in the development of the Project Laboratory course. This unique course sequence has given generations of undergraduate students a firm foundation in the experimental solution of problems as well as the skills of communication and team work which are essential to the practice of engineering. In the early 1990s he led the development of a new undergraduate curriculum in chemical engineering, which included core courses in materials and biochemical engineering, a feature that was unique in Canada at that time. In 1990, he was awarded the Class of '51 Outstanding Teacher Award by the Faculty of Engineering. He was a vigorous and enthusiastic supervisor of his graduate students. He supervised 18 Doctor of Philosophy and 29 Master of Engineering theses during his time at McGill.

Professor Weber's research focused on the application of transport processes. His research was always curiosity driven. The research was eclectic, and all his papers demonstrate a solid understanding of the field and contain an excellent mix of theory and experimental work. His research interests varied as he progressed in his career. He worked on diverse projects, which included control of water pollution by precipitation and extraction; soil remediation by in-situ washing and by electro-kinetic means; the use of surfactants in separation processes; electro-osmotic dewatering; multiphase flow and transport phenomena. He published eighty-six research papers in some of the most respected scientific and engineering journals of the profession. He was also awarded several patents. The text "Bubbles, Droplets and Particles", which he co-authored with Professors Roland Clift and John Grace in 1978, remains the classic text in the field.

Professor Weber served with distinction in university administration and governance. For at least 20 years he was the Graduate Program Director of Chemical Engineering. He also served as the Chair of the Planning Committee at the Faculty level. He served on most committees in the Department and numerous Committees at the Faculty and University levels. He was involved in so many different aspects that he was approached constantly for advice on thorny problems. He was always precise and saw the root of the problem.

On behalf of the Department of Chemical Engineering, the Faculty of Engineering, friends, colleagues and students from across McGill, we send our condolences to Marty's family, to his wife Nora, and to his four sons Mark, Larry, David and Gerry and their families.

2. Resolution on the death of Professor Emerita Dorothy Morton

The following resolution on the death of Professor Emerita Dorothy Morton was read by Dean Donald McLean, Dean of the Schulich School of Music, and adopted unanimously by Senate.

Dorothy Morton (née Breitman), Professor Emeritus of the Schulich School of Music, passed away following a stroke on Wednesday, September 17, 2008, her 84th birthday.

A native Montrealer, graduate of the legendary Baron Byng High School, Dorothy Morton came to McGill in the 1940s to study theory and composition with Claude Champagne, Douglas Clarke, Marvin Duchow, and Violet Archer. In parallel, she received her training in piano and chamber music at the Conservatoire de musique de Montréal. She graduated from both institutions in 1948 with a Bachelor of Music and a Diplôme des hautes études, and continued her piano studies privately with Isidor Philipp in New York. Returning to McGill's Faculty of Music as a piano teacher in 1954, Professor Morton became a member of the full-time staff in 1967, and was named Emeritus Professor in 1996.

A selective list of Professor Morton's extraordinary legacy of students includes William Benjamin, Paul Berkowitz, Rolf Bertsch, David Breitman, Richard Greenblatt, Steven Huebner, Michel Kozlovsky, Roger Lord, Robert Mayerovitch, Robert Silverman, Donald Steven, Ellen Wong Tso, and Kenneth Woodman. Dorothy Morton brought to her teaching a unique combination of formidable and forgiving. She had an exceptional ability to bring out the maximum potential of any student, and took great interest in following all aspects of their lives and personal development.

During her more than six decades of association with McGill, Professor Morton extended her influence as a pedagogue and a force for excellence in music as a frequent jury member for Canadian piano competitions. She became renowned as one of Canada's most gifted piano pedagogues. Most of her concert activity was as part of a two-piano team with Esther Master. The Morton-Master Duo made its concert debut at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in 1955 and was still active in 1991. Several discs were recorded by CBC records and recently re-released through McGill Records.

Predeceased by her former husband Dr. Allan Morton, we extended our condolences to her children Karen Wolmark (Pittsburgh), Jeffrey (Montreal), and David (Chicago), her grandchildren, great-grandchildren and extended family at the time of her passing. Thanks to the Dorothy Morton Visiting Artist fund, established in 2006 to bring internationally renowned artists to work with our students in master classes and recitals, the Schulich School will continue to honour Professor Morton's teaching and performing legacy.

3. Report of the Steering Committee

The report of the Steering Committee (08-09:06) was received.

Item 1. Approval of Minutes of Senate. On motion duly proposed and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 21, 2009 were approved.

Item 2. Speaking Rights. Senate, on motion duly proposed and seconded, granted speaking rights to Professor Robert Leckey for item IIB2, D08-38, the 407th Report of the Academic Policy Committee, and to Professor William Foster for item IIB3, D08-39, the Revision of Regulations Governing Emeritus Professor/Librarian, and item IIB4, D08-40, the Amendments to the Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct, and item IIA1, the Question re Intellectual Property Review.

Item 3. Confidential Session. On motion duly proposed and seconded, Senate agreed to move into Confidential Session for consideration of item IIB1 (Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee, D08-37).

4. Adoption of the Agenda

On motion duly proposed and seconded, the agenda was approved.

5. Chair's Remarks

The Principal opened her remarks by reporting that in the morning she had attended the opening of McGill's Office of Sustainability and thanked all those who contributed to the creation of the Office.

Concerning local press reports concerning compensation and severance for senior officers at McGill, the Principal commented that the University makes every effort to attract the best talent into its academic and leadership positions, and recruits for these positions globally. Over the last nine years, we have hired almost 900 people through international searches into both academic and administrative positions. She added that all senior appointments are made according to legislated procedures and where there have been departures, the University has honoured its contractual obligations, as would be expected. The University has also taken advantage of departures to realise efficiencies by restructuring portfolios, such as in the DAR and Public Affairs Offices.

Turning to the economy, the Principal referred to her open letter to the community and thanked all those who had responded. The Provost and the members of his Task Force on Economic Uncertainty will examine the best ways to cut costs and increase revenues while preserving the quality that is central to McGill's mission. The Principal's Task Force, to be launched soon, will examine how we can enhance access and diversity while continuing to grow in academic excellence.

These ongoing consultations will inform decisions to be taken about the budget and map the road ahead. In March, preliminary budget recommendations will be made to the Finance Committee. In April, the Principal will issue another open letter to the community, and the budget will be presented to the Board of Governors for approval in May.

The Principal reported that there had been some good news for universities in the federal budget released last month, with \$1.4 billion for infrastructure projects, and an additional \$750 million in CFI funding competitions. However, the main research funding agencies did not receive any increases.

On the subject of relations with the Quebec government, the Principal provided an update on the proposed governance legislation known as Bill 107, noting that the Board of Governors had

voted on Monday in favour of sending a letter from the Chair, the Principal and the Chancellor on its behalf to the provincial government outlining concerns with the legislation.

The Principal concluded her remarks by congratulating colleagues involved in the “Bravo!” event held the previous day, a celebration of McGill’s research successes, which will be followed by an exhibition in Redpath Hall that is open to the community. The Principal also thanked Vice-Principal Thérien and his staff for their work on the event.

Senator DeGuise asked how the representatives of the task forces were selected. The Principal replied that for administrative task forces, those who are chairing them choose people who they feel would be useful to their consultation processes. She noted that any policy matters arising from these task forces would be dealt with by the relevant governing bodies. She also noted that members of the community would have the opportunity to make representation to both task forces.

SECTION II

PART “A” – QUESTIONS AND MOTIONS BY MEMBERS

1. Question Regarding Intellectual Property Review

On the invitation of the Chair, Senator Gulamhussein asked the following question:

BACKGROUND:

Access to new health technologies makes a difference to the millions of people who are dying every year because they do not have access to life-saving health innovations. In 2008, UNAIDS reported that sixty-nine percent of people living with HIV in low and middle income countries do not have access to treatment.

The World Health Assembly (WHA) has recognized that the relationship between health and intellectual property (IP) issues should be addressed the world over and, in May 2008, adopted a "Global strategy on public health, innovation and intellectual property."

McGill University is a world-renowned leading research-intensive university and, as such, it is important that health needs—including needs in the developing world—are addressed through our IP policy. Further, Campaign McGill promises that McGill University will be "generating new technologies to improve human health" and public health, including the "transfer of knowledge from bench to bedside."

Following the Joint Senate-Board 2008 meeting, McGill is undergoing a review of its policies governing intellectual property.

Canadian Universities are moving towards adopting, or have already adopted, equitable licensing policies—such as UBC's strategy for enhancing global access to its technologies.

Other institutions, including the University of California Berkeley and the University of Vermont, have articulated similar ideas through social responsibility programs. Equitable licensing is also an important means of attracting investment in university research, as exemplified through UBC's experience with funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation as well as the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health.

QUESTION:

Will the IP review include an evaluation of equitable licensing practices?

What is the timeline for the IP review and when will it be finalized?

How will Senate, its committees, and its members be involved in the review process?

How can students, faculty, and other members of the university community get involved in the review?

The Chair invited the Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) to respond. Vice-Principal Thérien responded as follows:

The IP policy at McGill is now undergoing a planned cyclical review. Currently at early planning stages, the process of consultation and discussion is being designed. We thank the member of Senate for raising these issues at this juncture, giving us ample time to review the suggestions in the context of the process being established.

With respect to the specific questions:

1. *Equitable licensing practices will be reviewed as part of the new Innovation and Partnership Initiative of the VPRIR. We are aware of the UBC Global Access initiative and this, along with other University approaches, will form part of our considerations as we move forward.*
2. *The timeline for the review has not yet been finalized as the planning committee to establish the framework has been newly reconstituted and as yet not had its first meeting.*
3. *The IP policy is a policy of the University, and as such will be discussed in detail at two Senate sub-committees (the Research Policy Committee and the Academic Policy Committee) prior to coming to Senate, where it will again be open for discussion prior to a request for approval.*
4. *There are students and faculty represented on all three levels of the review process (RPC, APC and Senate), where they will have the opportunity to comment and improve the document as it evolves. In addition, it is the practice of the Office of the VPRIR in policy development to also seek the counsel of the Post-Graduate Students' Society and the McGill Association of University Teachers.*

In response to a question from Mr. Gulamhussein, Vice-Principal Thérien agreed to meet with members of the Global Health Network (present at the Senate meeting as observers) to hear their views on the issue. The Vice-Principal also noted that work on the policy would continue to include the participation of a student.

PART "B" – MOTIONS AND REPORTS FROM ORGANS OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

1. Confidential report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D08-37)

Senate moved into confidential session to discuss the Confidential Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee (D08-37) (this minute is not published or circulated but is attached to the permanent minutes of Senate as Appendix "A").

2. 407th Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D08-38)

The Provost presented the Report of the Academic Policy Committee (D08-38).

I. For Approval

A. New Teaching Programs

1) Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

Barbados Interdisciplinary Tropical Studies (BITS) Field Semester

Item IA1, Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, the Barbados Interdisciplinary Tropical Field Studies Field Semester, was approved.

2) Faculty of Science

B.Sc. in Biology and Mathematics; Joint Major

Item IA2, Faculty of Science, the B.Sc. in Biology and Mathematics; Joint Major, was approved.

C. Creation of New Units / Name Changes / Reporting Changes

1) Faculty of Arts

McGill Institute for Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies

Dean Manfredi expressed his support of the Institute and commented on the interdisciplinarity of its five research axes: Health and Wellness; Equity and Justice; Representation, Performance, Culture; Historical Perspectives; and Policy and Practices.

Mr. Hobbins asked why the Institute was not sponsored by more than one faculty, and asked what the difference is between a Research Centre and an Institute. The Provost replied that an Institute has a more interdisciplinary focus, and would not usually be housed in one faculty. Institutes also have responsibility for graduate level teaching programs, and increasingly, undergraduate teaching programs. They also have appointments made to them,

unlike Centres, whose members are existing appointments drawn from departments.

Dean Aitken noted that a number of faculties are involved in the Institute and observed that it would continue to situate McGill as a leader in teaching new ways of gathering and organizing knowledge within universities and internationally.

Professor Gehr supported the establishment of the Institute, but expressed discomfort at the inclusion of the word "feminist" in the name, which would have unsuitable political overtones, could be exclusionary towards men, and was also redundant because feminist approaches are already included with the words "gender" and "sexuality".

Professor Robaire spoke in support of the Institute, and wondered what would be the involvement of researchers in Medicine. Dean Kasirer spoke in favour of the Institute. Professor Zorychta spoke in favour of the Institute, adding that "feminist" could be understood to refer to equal rights for women. The Provost noted that Medicine had contributed to the consultation process for the creation of the Institute, and referred to Professor Leckey, who added that there had been a wide canvassing of ideas for selection of the Institute's research axes, including within Medicine, and that researchers from Medicine were welcome to the Institute's areas of study and interests. Ms. Wilkinson spoke in favour of the Institute, and Dean Manfredi added that Dr. Kathleen Cullen in Medicine has been closely involved with the Institute.

Item IC1, the McGill Institute for Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies, was approved.

2) Faculty of Science

McGill Biodiversity Research Centre

Item IC2, Faculty of Science, the McGill Biodiversity Research Centre, was approved.

III. Approved in the Name of Senate

Presented for information.

IV. For the Information of Senate

A. Report on Academic Program Reviews-2004-2008 Exercise

The Provost reported that this item was being presented now for information and will be brought back to a future meeting for discussion.

B. Courses and Teaching Programs

Presented for information.

3. Revision of Regulations Governing Emeritus Professor/Librarian (D08-39)

The Provost presented the Revisions of the Regulations Governing Emeritus Professor/Librarian (D08-39), emphasising that the amendments to the Regulations and the creation of the McGill University Medal form one proposal. He added that the 2009 convocations will proceed with emeritus status being awarded under the old system, and that the new system will be used from June 2009 onwards.

In response to questions concerning section 7.8.1(iii) and which standards would be considered, the Provost replied that the language used was the same as for the tenure process and promotion to full professor, and that the expectation is that those standards will continue. Professor Wolfson noted that 20 or 30 years ago, a promotion could have been made substantially on the basis of outstanding teaching, and asked if the same standard would be used now. Professor Foster replied that the same expectations would apply now as then, and the Provost observed that the wording "bearing in mind the different paths which the careers of senior academics may take" in section 7.8.1 recognizes this.

On the availability of post-retirement appointments to secure NSERC grants, the Provost indicated that such instances could be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Director of Libraries Schmidt noted that ten years of service was required for the medal, and five years for the conferral of emeritus, and wondered whether this was deliberate, to which the Provost replied that these criteria were intended to be different.

In response to a question from Mr. Hobbins regarding section 7.8.1, the Provost indicated that there would be follow up with a dean where a recommendation for emeritus status was not received.

Professor GowriSankaran spoke in support of the motion and asked whether "academic leadership" in Appendix D, criterion (iv) included exceptional service to the University. The Provost replied in the affirmative.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the motion was approved.

4. Amendments to Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct (D08-40)

The Vice-Principal (Research and International Relations) presented the amendments to the Regulations Concerning the Investigation of Research Misconduct (D08-40).

In response to a question from Professor Wolfson, the Principal said that there is a commitment on the part of the affiliated teaching hospitals to work with the University in the year ahead, with a view to coordinating policies and practices on data sharing.

Professor Zorychta asked for clarification of "substantive evidence" in section 5.3. Professor Foster replied that it refers to evidence establishing the fact, and that the University must not turn a blind eye to research misconduct where supporting evidence of it has been presented, regardless of whether or not the source is anonymous. Professor Foster observed that even if section 5.3 was omitted, the University would still need to act on an anonymous allegation supported by substantial evidence in order to comply with granting agency requirements. He

added that once such an allegation had been made, it would still be subject to the normal mechanisms and all the standard protections for the employee would be in place.

Professor Zannis-Hadjopoulos asked whether substantive evidence must accompany an allegation received under section 5.3 for the allegation to be acted upon. Professor Foster replied that it was needed, and that this was implicit in the provision.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the motion was approved.

5. Presentation – Academic Salary Differentials

Professor Michael Smith gave a presentation concerning Academic Salary Differentials on behalf of the Committee on Academic Salary Policy. He thanked Professors Jenny Hunt and Daniel Parent of the Department of Economics, and Charles Lavergne from the Office of Planning and Institutional Analysis, for their help with the data and producing the report.

Professor Wolfson asked whether the predictors of salaries for women had been looked at separately, to see if they were the same predictors as those for men. Professor Smith replied that they were used in the methodology for the departmental groupings, but it would be useful to do more work with them.

Professor Hendren, noting that women were performing better than men overall in terms of merit, asked where women were losing out. Professor Smith replied that the two main factors to consider here are the effects of being recruited from outside the University, and the effects of awards (CRCs, Dawson, McGill Chairs and others). Professor Hendren asked what policy implications might follow from this, and Professor Smith replied that the Provost would come back with thoughts on that subject in a future presentation.

Professor Pekelis asked whether the data for Medicine was restricted to non-clinical departments in Medicine and PhDs in clinical departments, because MDs in clinical departments would be considered GFTUs. Professor Smith replied that this was correct; in clinical departments only a small number of people would be reflected.

Dean Kreiswirth asked whether leave periods that “stopped the clock” were taken into account. Professor Smith replied that maternity leave was looked at, and this made no difference to the overall pattern of results. He added that in relation to promotion from associate to full professor, very few maternity leaves are taken at the associate professor level.

The Principal observed that there had not been sufficient activity in the past in terms of nominating people for awards, irrespective of gender, and stressed that people cannot win awards if they are not nominated.

The Principal invited the Provost to say a few words. The Provost thanked Professor Smith for his report, and Professors Parent and Hunt for their substantial contributions. He noted that it is important to remember that CRCs were used only to recruit from outside the University and that there has been an issue with CRCs in general (not just at McGill) recruiting men. He added that the focus of the analysis is McGill’s pay system, where rank is important, and in this context he had made suggestions that had not been incorporated into Professor Smith’s presentation. When rank is introduced, gender difference becomes less significant, and so what accounts for the difference in rank is important. There is a differential promotion time from associate to full professor, which takes an average of 8.9 years for women and 8.6 years for men, which sounds

like a small difference but has cumulative effects over time and taking into account that there have been times when \$5,000 was added to salary at the point of promotion. The Provost said that he will bring this item back to a future meeting with comment and policy recommendations.

Professor Smith replied that the problem with considering mean promotion times is that it does not take into account the fact that some people are not promoted at all. His analysis had taken that into account. He also noted that significant differences remained after controlling for rank, and added that these were the reasons why the Provost's suggestions had not been incorporated.

6. Report Card – Student Life and Learning (D08-41)

The Deputy Provost presented the Report Card on Student Life and Learning (D08-41).

Professor Hendren questioned the value of NSSE questions such as those questioning activities that enhance spiritual practice. Professor Grüter also questioned what conclusions could be drawn from the NSSE data. The Deputy Provost explained that the premise of the NSSE questions is that engagement in university life will be reflected in more than academic activities. The Principal added that it is used by the Association of American Universities as the most well-known benchmark, as well as by the G13 in Canada, and there is good reason to participate in evaluations alongside peer institutions.

Mr. Dyck commented favourably on the survey but asked about how McGill is evaluating improvements. The Deputy Provost replied that for example in Arts, the advising service was being evaluated by the advising survey, and that across the University, managers were being engaged in service excellence training to measure the performance of their staff.

In response to a question from Mr Neilson regarding next steps following the report, the Deputy Provost replied that there will be a broad range of initiatives, such as the integrated services initiative, the roll-out of service excellence training, improved mentorships between students and faculty, and between undergraduate and graduate students, and a strategic plan for food at McGill.

Senator Dourley asked whether there are any new academic initiatives connected with class sizes, and the Deputy Provost responded that the new method of academic program review to be used going forward would help to identify program aspects that can be improved. In response to a question from Ms. Turner concerning exit surveys, the Deputy Provost replied that the University should be doing more in this area.

On the subject of student-faculty interaction, Professor Moore commented that students rarely go to office hours, which was part of the problem. The Deputy Provost replied that improvements are being sought in this area, for example, research appointments for undergraduates are being promoted, and Teaching and Learning Services is launching a teaching and learning symposium to address strategies for engaging students in faculty interaction. Redesigned classes using clicker technology have also looked at the matter of student engagement.

Dean Grant commented that enriching the educational experience by encouraging spirituality was not advancing academic goals, and he expressed the hope that the University would not work to improve the survey scores at the expense of advancing the academic goals. The Deputy Provost replied that the aim was to promote and improve student engagement with the

University at all levels, and that students who are more engaged are more likely to stay involved and continue to contribute, whether as alumni or in other capacities.

Mrs Schmidt commented that the report uses a narrow definition of the online experience, and that student life is much more varied than is reflected by the survey questions.

Mr DeGuise observed that the University seems to have a problem with respect to students not receiving oral and/or written feedback from faculty, and wondered what plans were in development to address the problem. The Principal said that this point would be taken into consideration.

The Principal thanked the Deputy Provost for his presentation, and encouraged all to engage with the themes raised.

On a motion duly proposed and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.